

# THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1884.

## I.

### THE SALVATION OF INFANTS.

BY PROFESSOR E. V. GERHART, D. D.

THE Presbyterian Review for July, 1883, contains an article entitled: *Infant Salvation and its Theological Bearings*, from the pen of Prof. George L. Prentiss, D. D., of Union Theological Seminary, which, for its bold divergence from the doctrine of the Westminster standards concerning the salvation of infants, has deservedly arrested attention, and called forth comment by the religious press. The author surrenders the postulates of the decretal system of Calvinism in their bearing on the future state of infants dying in infancy, and squarely commits himself to the directly opposite opinion of Arminius, Episcopius and the Remonstrants generally of the seventeenth century, that all infants, baptized or unbaptized, whether the children of Christian or of heathen parents, are, through the mercy of God, unconditionally saved. Characterized by independent thought, historical candor and earnest Christian sentiment, this significant article invites and merits critical inquiry into the dogmatic conceptions which it advances on a question

at once profoundly solemn and far-reaching in its theological and practical bearings.\*

After referring to the marked reticence of the New Testament in reference to little children, and quoting an important passage bearing upon the question of their salvation (Mark 10 : 13-16), the article proceeds to give a succinct historical review of the doctrine held by Augustine and the Roman Church, by the Reformers, but especially by the Calvinistic theologians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Augustine connected salvation mechanically with the sacrament of baptism, and drew the inference that unbaptized infants were lost, though "their punishment was of the mildest sort,—the loss of heaven rather than the torment of hell." The doctrine of Augustine became the doctrine of the Roman Catholic church, and has reigned in that communion, without essential modification, to the present time.

The same inference, drawn from the necessity of infant baptism, became the general belief in the Reformed and Lutheran churches throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

This general belief was modified by the metaphysical principle of unconditional election, as affirmed by the decrees of the Synod of Dort, by the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Assembly, and by other Reformed symbols. Unconditional election is applicable to infants no less than to adults. Some are elect; others are non-elect. The saving virtue of baptism avails for elect infants only. Says the Confession of Faith: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth." Non-elect infants are not regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit. This difference between the

\* In a foot-note the author remarks: "The doctrine of infant salvation has deep roots, and involves grave theological problems. My aim in the following paper is chiefly to furnish hints and points of view, that may possibly aid in finding these roots and in solving these problems. It is only a brief study on what has long seemed to me to be a very great subject."

salvability of elect and non-elect infants underlies the teaching of the Confession on the virtue of baptism.

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and a seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of remission of sins, and of his giving up unto God through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life: which sacrament is, by Christ's own appointment, to be continued in His church until the end of the world.

"Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect His ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed to it, as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.

"The efficacy of baptism is not tied to that moment of time wherein it is administered; yet, notwithstanding by the right use of this ordinance the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost, to such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own Will, in His appointed time."\*

The Confession means that the elect may be regenerated by the Spirit, though unbaptized, and that the non-elect are not regenerated by the Spirit in baptism, but that by the right use of this ordinance the promised grace is by the Holy Ghost communicated to the elect, whether they be of age or infants. The logical consequence is that non-elect infants are lost, baptized or unbaptized, whether children of the heathen or of believers. Dr. Prentiss shows at some length, by apt citations from eminent theologians, that this belief was the doctrine commonly received by the Reformed churches on the continent, by the Anglican communion, and by the Presbyterian organizations of Scotland; and, though not a few eminent men like Hooker argued in favor of a milder view, yet the belief either

\* Conf. of Faith, chap. 28, secs. 1, 5, 6.

that unbaptized infants or non-elect infants, dying in infancy, have no part in the salvation of Christ, prevailed in these Protestant bodies down to the present century.

He then traces the history of the reaction against this severe doctrine, and ascribes the most potent modifying influence to "the growth of Baptist sentiments, the influence of Quakerism, and the Arminian controversy;" yet the reaction in churches holding firmly the decretal system was slow and gradual; and the contrary opinion did not obtain formal or authoritative expression until the present century and in our own time. Dr. Charles Hodge is the most prominent Presbyterian theologian of America who first gave dogmatic expression to the contrary belief that all infants dying in infancy are saved; thus joining issue with the Presbyterian standards and with all representative theologians of the Calvinistic school.

The language of Dr. Hodge is as follows:

"The common doctrine of Evangelical Protestants is that all who die in infancy are saved. This is inferred from what the Bible teaches of the analogy between Adam and Christ (Rom. v. 18, 19). We have no right to put any limit on these general terms except what the Bible itself places upon them. The Scriptures nowhere exclude any class of infants, baptized or unbaptized, born in Christian or in heathen lands, of believing or unbelieving parents, from the benefits of the redemption of Christ. . . . Not only, however, does the comparison which the apostle makes between Adam and Christ, lead to the conclusion that as all are condemned for the sins of one, so all are saved by the righteousness of the other, those only excepted whom the Scriptures except; but the principle assumed throughout the whole discussion teaches the same doctrine. That principle is, that it is more congenial with the nature of God to bless than to curse, to save than to destroy.\*

\* The love of God is righteous and holy. Love to righteousness is aversion to unrighteousness, and love to the good is hatred against the evil. Wrath is the infinite repugnance of love to sin. If sin and wickedness, the direct con-



If the race fell in Adam, much more shall it be restored in Christ. If death reigned by one, much more shall grace reign by one. This 'much more' is repeated over and over. The Bible everywhere teaches that God delighteth not in the death of the wicked; that judgment is His strange work. It is, therefore, contrary to the whole spirit of the passage (Romans, v. 12-21), to exclude infants from 'the all' who are made alive in Christ.

"The conduct and language of our Lord in reference to children are not to be regarded as matters of sentiment, or simply expressive of kindly feeling. He evidently looked upon them as the lambs of the flock for which, as the Good Shepherd, He laid down His life, and of whom He said they shall never perish, and no man could pluck them out of His hands. Of such, He tells us, is the kingdom of heaven, as though heaven was, in a great measure, composed of the souls of redeemed infants. It is, therefore, the general belief of Protestants, contrary to the doctrine of Romanists and Romanizers, that all who die in infancy are saved."

This passage is a definite statement of the opinion now commonly received by Evangelical Protestants concerning the salvation of infants. It is the final result of the reactionary movement which has been progressing with gradually increasing momentum for more than two centuries, both against the hard inference of Augustine from the necessity of baptism and the no less severe logical consequence of unconditional election. Accepting this current sentiment as Christian truth, Dr. Prentiss

tradictory to God and His authority, did not kindle His anger, He would not be holy love. The principle "that it is more congenial with the nature of God to bless than to curse, to save than to destroy," is true, if predicated of God in His relation to Himself, to all the good, and to His creatures who are capable of being made good like Himself; but not true when predicated of Him in His relation to wickedness, and to angels or men who wilfully persist in transgressing and despising the righteous law of grace. It is just as worthy of God, just as congenial with the holiness of infinite love, to condemn the wrong as to approve the right, to curse the wrong-doer who wilfully renounces the supreme good, as to bless the penitent believer in Christ.

does not proceed to support it by further exposition of the New Testament, nor by arguments from the nature of Christianity ; but, assuming that there is no room to question the validity of the general proposition, holds it to be a fundamental axiom, which may be justly applied to the various questions in theology with which it is directly or indirectly connected. This idea, the universal salvation of infants, becomes the criterion by which received doctrines, I may say, principles, explicitly taught by the New Testament, are to be judged. Accordingly the author passes on to consider the bearing which this idea, accepted as an axiomatic truth must have, 1. upon the doctrine respecting original sin and the subjective conditions of pardon and eternal life ; 2. upon the doctrine of man's spiritual nature and immortality ; 3. upon the doctrine respecting the visible church and the means of grace ; 4. upon the conception of this life as a probation, and upon doctrine respecting the life beyond the grave ; 5. upon the question of the salvability of the heathen ; and 6. upon our conception of the Providential system. In relation to all these grave problems, as I cannot but understand the respected author, he maintains that universal infant salvation must be allowed by theology to have the regulative force of an *a priori* truth.

In the discussion of infant salvation relatively to these branches of theological inquiry, Dr. Prentiss takes some positions which are forcibly stated and demonstrably valid. His argument against the theory of probation which has come into vogue since the time of Bishop Butler, especially merits the serious consideration both of theology and the pulpit. Yet the method adopted and pursued is, to say the least, of doubtful logical propriety. It is admitted that the New Testament is remarkably reticent on the condition of infants dying in infancy. If we except the exegesis of Dr. Hodge on Rom. 5 : 12-21, and on 1 Cor. 15 : 22, we have no more than a probable inference in support of universal infant salvation. His exegesis, however, is certainly questionable. If these passages can be used to support the belief in universal infant salvation, they must

also have a wider range of legitimate application. From these premises an argument could with equal propriety be constructed, especially if the necessity of personal faith in Jesus Christ be superseded, to sustain, not only the salvation of infants, but the salvation of all men, infants and adults, without exception. On exegetical grounds it may also be questioned, whether the rich and beautiful words of our Lord (Mark, 10: 13-16), have any direct bearing on the future blessedness of infants dying in infancy. The disciples assumed that little children were too insignificant to receive the attention of their Master. Jesus rebukes this assumption. The instincts of Jewish mothers were true and good. Children were not to be shut out from His blessing because they had not yet attained to the age of men and women, but young and old, children and parents alike, were to come to Him, and were designed for the kingdom; moreover, the confiding, receptive and docile spirit of childhood was the fit image of that state of heart and mind with which men and women were required to receive the kingdom of God. Certainly, the passage teaches that little children are embraced within the compass of Jesus' saving love. He guaranteed to them, though not yet self-conscious nor personally responsible, the right to receive His blessing and become members of the Messianic kingdom. By necessary implication, He teaches also that they are capable of participating in His redemption. But these truths, though far-reaching in their bearing, and applicable to the transearthly as well as the earthly life of infants, nevertheless fall short of supporting the universal proposition that all infants dying in infancy are unconditionally saved.\*

To make an opinion, which by common consent is not based on any explicit teaching of the New Testament, and at most

\* Mark, 10: 13-16 has a direct bearing on the spiritual significance of infant baptism: As when on earth Jesus received little children to Himself and blessed them with His Messianic blessing, so now, for He is the same in heaven as on earth, He admits them to fellowship with Himself by His appointed means of grace, and touches them with His own hand. They are not to be excluded from real communication with the Saviour because they are too young to come of themselves, but must be brought by loving parents.

can be supported only inferentially by several passages, a fundamental principle of theological reasoning, is a method of argument which may be justly challenged. Does not this method reverse the normal order of thought? Should not the truth which by Scripture is most definitely stated, and which enters into the essence of the Christian life, have *a priori* force? Should not such truth direct theological reflection on those questions in regard to which the New Testament says little or nothing? I respect the ability with which Dr. Prentiss conducts his argument, and honor the genuine Christian spirit which animates his entire article; nevertheless, with all due deference to his learning and theological culture, I cannot but entertain the judgment that his method will not bear the test of fair criticism.

Let me not be misunderstood. Before proceeding further, I, without hesitation, express my full concurrence with the author in the aim of his article under its negative aspects. The notion that unbaptized infants, or that non-elect infants, dying in infancy, are, just for the reason that they have not been baptized or are not among the elect, consigned to perdition, contradicts my views both of Christianity and of human life; and I am in full sympathy with the purpose of his argument in opposing traditional opinions which are incompatible with the spirit of the gospel and with the Christian conception of man. Yet, whilst I join with him in denying the Augustinian inference from the necessity of baptism and the cruel postulate of the Calvinistic decretal system, I cannot concur with him in affirming the doctrinal conception advanced by Dr. Hodge, that all infants dying in infancy are saved. Certainly, I do not for a moment question the correctness of the statement that "the Scriptures nowhere exclude any class of infants, baptized or unbaptized, born in Christian or in heathen lands, of believing or unbelieving parents, from the benefits of the redemption of Christ." But, whilst the Scriptures do not exclude them from the redemption of Christ, just because they are infant children, or because they are born of unbelieving or pagan parents, it does

not, reasoning on Christian principles, follow that they are certainly saved. The opinion that unbaptized or non-elect infants must be consigned to perdition, I believe to be unscriptural; but from the falsity of this proposition we cannot reason to the truth of the contrary opposite. Both doctrines, namely, that many infants dying in infancy must perish, and that all infants dying in infancy are saved, appear to me to be contrary to the nature of Christianity as taught by the New Testament, and contrary to the Christian idea of personal freedom. Both are constructed on the basis of a magical conception of salvation.

This solemn question respecting the salvation of infants dying in infancy must be studied under the guidance of general Christian principles which are definitely taught by the Word of God. Some speculation is unavoidable; but speculation will be valid if it be a legitimate development and application of these principles. Some of them I propose now to consider in their relation to the doctrine of universal infant salvation as presented and applied by Dr. Prentiss.

#### THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST.

The final epoch in the history and personal character of mankind, whether infants or adults, is not natural death, but the second coming of Jesus Christ in glory. When passing through the article of death men possess essentially the same ethico-religious life which they have during the earthly period of their existence. They enter into another realm. This is a period rather than a state, an age or æon in which, analogous to the difference between believers and unbelievers on earth, they live a life of communion with the only Mediator Jesus Christ or live a life of unbelief and rebellion against Him. They are blessed or miserable according to the personal relation to Him which they freely occupy. This transearthly period of human life anterior to the resurrection and the judgment is a part of the mundane economy, and anticipates the parousia. That day, often called in our English New Testament "the

appearing" of Jesus Christ, will close both the earthly and transearthly periods or ages of human history, and bring in the "world to come."

Natural death is undoubtedly a solemn event; nay, a momentous crisis in the history of each individual whether infant or adult; but the second coming of our Lord is unspeakably more solemn and significant for all men, believers or unbelievers. Upon that day, that final epoch, all the books of the New Testament as with one voice fix the gaze of the church and the world. This last fact of the Christian redemption is represented as the goal of faith and hope. Compared with the issues of the ultimate crisis, the issues of natural death, however solemn, are nevertheless of inferior significance.

I cannot pause in order to prove by citations from the Gospels and Epistles, either that the New Testament teaches explicitly that Jesus Christ will come again to judge the quick and the dead or that His second coming, not natural death, is the final and absolutely decisive epoch in the moral and religious history of men. Under some form our best theologies all teach it, and the œcumenical creeds confess it. Being so explicitly taught in the New Testament and so generally accepted by the Protestant confessions of faith, I may properly assume that no evangelical theologian will deny that the second advent of our Lord enters as necessarily into the scriptural idea of His Messianic kingdom as His first advent.

It is a mistake therefore to regard natural death as the final or decisive event in relation to the eternal condition of infants dying in infancy. Theology and the pulpit have in our times allowed the reality and momentous significance of the parousia to recede in great measure from the Christian consciousness of the church, and as an unavoidable consequence have raised the crisis of natural death to a position of prominence which it does not hold in the teachings of the New Testament or the economy of redemption.

In the article under review there is no recognition of the day of judgment at the second coming of Christ as the final epoch

of human history. As I understand the entire argument, the exit from our present earthly state is decisive.

MORAL AGENCY OF INFANTS.

Infants dying in infancy do not continue to be unconscious infants in the transearthy period of human existence. Such a notion has possession of the minds of many Christian parents. Bereft of a sweet innocent babe they are inclined to remember it as a babe, and from year to year imagine it to be an unconscious child in the invisible world. But there is no warrant for such a notion either in Scripture or in anthropology. An infant begins to grow and develop from the first day of its birth. Uniting in itself potentially soul and body, both unfold and by the force of an immanent law grow towards physical and moral manhood. This principle is inseparable from the idea of our personal being. Natural death does not abolish the law of human development. The transition from the earthly to the transearthy period may involve convulsive throes more thoroughgoing than we can describe or imagine; nevertheless, as natural birth is an epoch onward in the progress of human life, so a child in and after the exit from earth is as truly human as when living in the natural body. This principle that a person after his departure from the present life is as truly a human being as when living on earth is presupposed by all theological discussions respecting the future state of infants. If we deny it or question it, there is no meaning in the problem before us.

Infants dying in infancy develop into self-consciousness and freedom, and thus become moral agents.\* Moral agency con-

\* Says Dr. Dorner: "Es ist nun wieder darauf zu achten, dass es der menschlichen Persönlichkeit, und mit ihr dem Begriff der Schuld, wesentlich ist, an ein *Werden* oder an eine Geschichte gebunden zu sein. Von niedrigen Stufen, in denen die Persönlichkeit fast verschwindet, und nur erst potenziell gesetzt ist, erhebt sie sich erst zu sich selbst, zur Actualität der sie constituirenden formellen Functionen, demgemäss, dass jeder Mensch von Gott gewollt ist, als ein eigenthümliches Wesen, das seinen sittlichen Werth oder Unwerth durch eigene Bethheiligung festzustellen hat. *Es muss jedes menschliche Wesen*

ditions their character in relation to God no less after than before death. For aught we know to the contrary, mental and moral development may be more rapid and decisive. A new born babe, as we know from daily observation, if it does not grow, and if growth does not include soul and body, becomes a grotesque deformity, an idiot, an object of dread. The same law must operate in the hereafter. Should we assume that an infant after death does not become a moral agent, we should have an unconscious child transformed into a monster, incapable either of spiritual blessedness or moral suffering.

The present period of our existence and the future period intermediate between natural death and the parousia are two parts of one human life, different from one another, but not contradictory. If a human being in passing through the article of death is not transmuted into something that is inhuman, but if instead an individual as to all the essential qualities of man's being is identical with himself in the earthly and transearthly periods of his history, we may safely reason from the one to the other, at least as regards the distinctive qualities of human nature. If here the self-determination of the will, subjectively considered shapes moral character for good or evil, and if moral and religious character alone fit a man for peace and happiness, this ethical principle must be the basis of sound judgment concerning the status of a personal being hereafter. The infant in the transearthly age develops into a moral agent, and will thus form his own moral and religious character. On this character which the infant forms by the process of moral development, however rapid we may imagine his development to be, will depend his blessedness or misery. The human conditions of spiritual well-being in the transearthly period do not differ from the human conditions of spiritual well-being on

*actuelle Persönlichkeit werden, sei es gute, sei es böse. Denn für das ethisch Gute ist zwar der Mensch geschaffen, aber weder das Gute noch das Böse hat in ihm seine volle Entschiedenheit und persönliche Reife, bevor das Subject im Stande war, sich an seiner sittlichen Selbstbildung frei zu betheiligen und damit auch sein Schicksal definitiv mitzubestimmen."* Dogmatik, II, p. 164.



earth. It is the wicked only who fall under the divine curse. It is the righteous only who can have peace and joy in God. But no one is personally wicked unless he hates the supreme good and loves moral evil; and no one is personally righteous unless he loves the supreme good and hates moral evil.

Theology and the pulpit will have to modify their mode of reflection on the state of infants after death. A sound judgment respecting their salvation is to be governed by the same law which governs our judgment respecting those who grow up to manhood on earth; there is only this difference. Adults have formed a moral and religious character through the exercise of personal freedom, and with this character pass into the transearthly age, whilst infants at the moment of their exit have, by no free act of their own will, embraced either good or evil, and will therefore form a moral and religious character after they have departed this life.

#### SAVING GRACE AND SAVING FAITH.

Two factors enter into the New Testament idea of salvation. The one is the free grace of God in Jesus Christ, imparted through the agency of His Holy Spirit. The other is faith in Jesus Christ, or the free act by which the subject appropriates to himself the life and salvation of Christ. The one is primary, the other secondary; but neither is effective without the other. Divine grace anticipates true faith; and true faith presupposes divine grace.

The New Testament teaches both with equal explicitness. Sometimes man's salvation is ascribed to the power and grace of God, or directly to Jesus Christ, without reference to the personal condition of faith. For example: "Being now justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through Him." Again: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one many shall be made righteous." \* Should we take these and similar passages as the

\* Rom. 5: 9, 19.

only basis of judgment, we might infer that our salvation depends exclusively upon the redemptive work of Christ, in other words, that sinners are saved solely by the operation of the mercy of God. There are also many passages which teach directly the opposite. Salvation is ascribed, not to God's mercy, but to the faith of the sinner. For example: "Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God."\* "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved."† "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."‡ Should these and similar texts be interpreted without any reference to the former class, we might infer that there is saving virtue in the personal act of believing. But every intelligent Christian knows that these two classes of passages are complementary. There is also a large number of passages in which these two opposite factors are taught in their immediate connection with each other. Says St. Paul: The gospel is "the power of God to salvation to every one that believeth."§ "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life."|| "For we, through the Spirit, wait for the hope of righteousness by faith."¶ "By grace are ye saved through faith."\*\* These citations are instances of a twofold mode of statement common to all the writers of the New Testament. God's grace and true faith, or the redemption wrought out by Christ and the appropriation of Him by man's act, are distinct and different things; yet personal salvation includes both.

Each factor, saving grace and saving faith, is essential in the history of personal salvation; but each performs a function answering to its own nature.

"It is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that

\* Rom. 5: 1.      † Rom. 10: 13.      ‡ Acts 16: 31.      § Rom. 1: 16.

|| Jno. 3: 16.

¶ Gal. 5: 5.

\*\* Eph. 2: 8; cf. John 1: 12; 8: 12. Matt. 11: 28. Phil. 2: 12, 13. Rev. 10: 19-22. 1 Peter 1: 3-5.

Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." He, the incarnate Son of God, is the union of God and man, the atonement for sin, and the victory over death. No other man has actualized in his history the divine ideal of manhood. No other has been subject to the law of dissolution, and yet by sinless righteousness and absolute holiness has changed dissolution into transcendent and eternal life. Hence He becomes the Mediator, the only Mediator between God and the fallen human race. "There is no other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." It is not necessary to introduce additional quotations. No truth is by the New Testament taught more definitely and uniformly than that no man can come unto the Father but by Jesus Christ. The power, to annul the law of sin in the sinner, to take away guilt and quicken eternal life, is at hand in Him, and in Him alone. There is no mercy of God available for our race as a whole or for the individual, whether adult or infant, but that which has been manifested and actualized in His work of reconciliation.

This principle, or the divine factor in the work of man's redemption, has universal validity; that is to say, Jesus Christ is the Mediator for all the members of the human family, whether living before or after His advent in the flesh. The claim of our Lord as to His Mediatorship is absolute. If any antediluvians escape condemnation in the day of judgment, their salvation will be due to God's forgiving mercy active in Him. If any among the heathen, who have died without the knowledge of the gospel, attain to eternal life, this triumph will be attributable to the regeneration of which He is the principle. Jesus, the incarnate Son of God, the only way of salvation and of true communion with the Father, has significance alike for the earthly and the transearthly periods of human existence. In other words, if there be authority to hold that men who die in an unregenerate state, but have not rejected God manifest in the flesh, may stand accepted at the second coming of Christ, this acceptance will be the consequence of God's saving grace, which in and through Him, the

only Mediator, has wrought in them with redeeming virtue. Says our Lord: "No man cometh unto the Father but by me." The equivalent of these words is expressed by Paul thus: "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

The mediatorial idea is, by common consent, a fundamental principle in the Christian religion; we cannot limit nor circumscribe its application. If we suppose that in the trans-earthly age God's mercy may lay hold of men immediately, or through some medium other than the incarnate Son, we relinquish Christianity and commit ourselves to pagan premises.

The human factor, or faith in Jesus Christ, is equally essential to personal salvation; but for a different reason. Faith accepts and appropriates Christ, His life, His atoning sacrifice, His victory over death. In the believer the fulness of His life and salvation becomes a transforming power; but in no other person. Grace becomes saving in us when by our own act we receive it, and open our moral and spiritual being to its agency; we thus make it our own possession. The necessity of freely accepting Christ is taught in Scripture as definitely and uniformly as the complementary truth that Jesus Christ is the only Saviour of the world.

Faith in Christ makes the sinner righteous before God in a twofold sense. The penalty due to his sin is remitted, and instead of being evil he becomes morally good. Of both forms of spiritual benefit Christ becomes the author when from the heart He is received. Being God and man in one person, the final perfection of manhood in vital union with the absolute manifestation of the Godhead, Christ is for man the supreme good. Having by the sacrifice of Himself under law and by His resurrection from the dead made the true atonement for sin, He is the living reconciliation between God and condemned men. When the mediator is acknowledged and accepted He is appropriated in the wholeness of His mediatorship. By this exercise of divine faith fallen men possess in Him both the reconciliation with God and the supreme good. Believers

obtain the forgiveness of sins because they have in themselves the virtue of the true atonement; and they stand in positively right relation to God, because by receiving into their hearts Him who is the supreme good they do the primordial right. They honor the Father because they honor the Son.

Faith is the activity of the whole man, including especially the self-determination of the will. Hereby Christ becomes a living principle in our ethical life, working by love, and yielding peace and joy. The right relation being established in Christ between God and the believer, this relation becomes a living communion. God imparts freely of His fulness to him, and he takes delight in God as his satisfying portion. This reciprocal communion is love.

The communion of love implies peace. The aversion of man to God, expressed by the violation of God's law, and the condemning judgment of God on the transgressor, are the effect of man's apostacy and sin. When by receiving Christ the subject freely chooses the reconciliation and the supreme good, he by that act renounces his apostacy and sinfulness, and his spiritual attitude toward God is reversed. No longer at issue with God's authority, he lives in harmony and sympathy with the will of holy love. Living in full sympathy with the authority of absolute love and possessing in his heart the supreme good, the believer has a divine joy which is unspeakable.

Joy, peace and love presuppose saving faith. Jesus Christ, the only reconciliation, is God's free gift of unfathomable love; and this gift must be freely accepted and appropriated in order that the alienation produced by apostacy and transgression may be superseded, and a relation between man and God be brought about which is righteous. So long as the right relationship does not exist, love and hope, peace and joy are by the law of truth rendered impossible.

The necessity of saving faith is an universal necessity. Objectively, Christ is the central fact of human redemption. Subjectively, faith is the pivot on which the scriptural doctrine

of personal salvation turns. As Christ is the indispensable necessity for all men, infants or adults, whether on earth or in the transearthly period of existence, so does the obligation of faith in Christ bind all men without exception, whether among the living or among the dead. The words of our Lord: No man cometh unto the Father but by me, have equal force in both directions. Not only are we taught that He is the only Mediator, but no less definitely that all who would be saved must come to the Father by Him. He who does not freely accept Him, does not come to the Father. As infants who die in infancy develop into moral agents, faith in Christ is an obligation which binds them as it binds all others. If they receive Him they have in Him eternal life. If they reject Him, they reject the supreme good and the only reconciliation with God; and by this rejection they abide under the law of sin and misery.

From some expressions of Dr. Prentiss it may be inferred that he questions the necessity of faith for infants who die in infancy. He remarks:

"Infant salvation has an important bearing also upon doctrine respecting the subjective conditions of being saved. In the case of adults, to whom Christ has been made known, these conditions are repentance, and faith, and obedience. But the salvation of infants would seem to prove that such conditions are not always necessary. Neither singly, or united, are faith, repentance and obedience the meritorious ground of any man's salvation. The doctrine of justification by faith is, indeed, most precious; by it the church of God stands. But this is not because there is any saving virtue in our faith; in itself faith is no better than love or hope; what clothes faith with such wondrous power is, that by it we lay hold of and appropriate Christ, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption. But infants cannot so embrace Christ; and, therefore, taking them up in His everlasting arms and laying His once pierced hands upon them, He, by the Spirit, impregnates their unconscious souls

with the virtues of His death and unites them to Himself, without condition. And this shows, as perhaps nothing else could show, that our salvation is all and altogether of grace—a sweet, pure gift of Divine Love.”

With Dr. Prentiss I do not of course join issue in his positive statement respecting faith: “What clothes faith with such wondrous power is that by it we lay hold of and appropriate Christ.” But in taking the position that infants who die in infancy are saved unconditionally by renewing grace, or, to repeat his own words, that Christ “impregnates their unconscious souls with the virtues of His death and unites them to Himself, without condition,” it seems to me that he comes into conflict with an evangelical principle just as essential, though not as fundamental, to the integrity of the Christian salvation as “renewing grace.” If grace may work its saving effects in the subjects of salvation “without condition,” that is, if God may deliver moral agents from the perverting forces, not to say condemnation, of moral evil, whether the subjects by their own active response appropriate the redemptive virtue of the mediator or do not appropriate His mediatorship, then “renewing grace” becomes divine magic; and a magical salvation, instead of annulling the perverting forces of moral evil, is itself an abnormal and alien force; for it deals with a moral agent, not according to the autonomy of his ethical life, but as if he were a passive subject possessing only an unethical nature.

The obligation to believe is not an arbitrary imposition. Faith is not only a part of the objective scheme of redemption as taught in Scripture, but it has its ground also in man’s psychological life. By the law of our ethical constitution the will enters into the idea of righteousness and holiness. Actual salvation from sin, or the unfolding of the new life in righteousness, means the free choice of the supreme good, which is Christ, God manifest in the flesh. The obverse of this positive free choice is the negation of sin, or the hatred of all moral evil. As no one can be lost who receives and loves the supreme good, so no one can be saved who loves moral evil. Or I may

say, no one is righteous before God unless he does the primordial right, and for one who needs salvation the only right to be done is to acknowledge and appropriate Him who is the way, and the truth and the life. The sentiment that a person may be redeemed who does not believe in the only redemption, or that he may be delivered from the evils of sin if he does not freely live a life of holy communion with the Mediator, is, it seems to me, plainly a contradiction in terms.

Scripture is not silent on the perpetual necessity of faith. In his lofty poem on charity or love, the Apostle Paul contrasts faith, hope and love with some extraordinary gifts of the Spirit,\* and says that these three *abide*. The gift of prophecy shall fail; the gift of tongues shall cease; and the gift of knowledge shall vanish away. These gifts of the Spirit are transient, and fulfil a temporary purpose. But when that which is perfect is come; when the Lord Himself shall appear and bring in the ultimate consummation of His creative and redeeming activity, then prophesying, speaking with tongues and fragmentary knowledge will be superseded. In the "world to come," the age of perfection and final glory, to which the redeemed shall be advanced at the Second Coming, these gifts will not prevail. Not so, however, with faith, hope, love. The just live by faith in the earthly and in the transearthly periods of their history, and they will live by faith the eternal life in the realm of final glory. Such is the obvious force of the argument pursued by the Apostle. Love is greater than hope. Love is greater than faith. Nevertheless as on earth, so hereafter, and in the final heaven, faith will be in order to hope and love; for by its ethical nature it will ever be the personal condition of right relationship to the Mediator, in which hope and love stand. Love is greater than faith as the oak is greater than the acorn; but for this very reason the eternal life of love will involve the normal activity of faith.

Let us also call to mind the fact that faith in the Lamb slain, now the glorified Mediator, is the keynote of the apoca-

\* 1 Cor. 13.



lyptic song of triumph and joy. After this "I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands, and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb."

The principle underlying the doctrine of universal infant salvation, Dr. Prentiss proceeds to apply to other allied classes of persons. To draw a line between unconscious infants and little boys and girls in whom original sin has begun to unfold itself, he properly regards as unwarrantable. "To draw an impassable dividing line between infants and all little boys and girls, for example, in whom original sin has just begun to act, seems most unwarrantably to limit the grace of God."\* Reasoning from his premises, the inference is undoubtedly legitimate. The doctrine also has bearings relatively to the heathen. Quoting the words from the Confession of Faith, that "the Spirit worketh when and where and how it pleaseth," the author feels justified in cherishing the strong hope that many heathen will be regenerated and saved by the Spirit. I can heartily join with him in entertaining the same hope. But if the response of saving faith is a factor in the process of personal salvation, as the New Testament explicitly teaches, this hope cannot be based solely on the premise that the Spirit worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth.†

The learned author himself, however, seems to concede the point on which I have been constrained to take issue with him as regards the fundamental premise of his article. In effect he

\* Presb. Rev. IV., p. 577.

† Interpreted in the light of God's absolute sovereignty, as taught by the Confession of Faith, this formula teaches two things,—the one positive and explicit, the other negative and implicit: 1. That the Spirit worketh when, and where, and how He pleaseth. 2. That the Spirit does not work when and where He does not please to work. If applied to the heathen, whether infants or adults, it obviously means that the Spirit saves those heathen whom it is His sovereign pleasure to save, and those whom it is not His sovereign pleasure to save He passes by.

says that nothing but unbelief will exclude the heathen from participation in God's renewing grace. His words are as follows :

"Universal infant salvation, then, does not and can not stand alone; it has a most important bearing upon the whole soteriological doctrine. It shows how inconceivably wide and deep is God's mercy in Jesus Christ. It shows that, speaking after the manner of men, He is doing all He can do for the actual redemption of the world; nothing keeps any soul from the gracious operation of His infinite love and pity but its own wilful choice of evil and refusal of the good: "*Nihil ardet in inferno nisi propria voluntas.*" "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live." \*

The statement that nothing keeps any soul from the gracious operation of God's infinite love and pity but its own wilful choice of evil and refusal of the good, is both scriptural and philosophical. It well expresses the general principle which I have been asserting and maintaining. But, in laying down this general principle, it appears to me that the author is shifting his ground. Millions of heathen living in the deep darkness of heathenism have passed through the gate of death into the trans-earthly age altogether innocent of the rejection of the gospel, and in this respect are as guiltless as unconscious infants who die in infancy; yet, according to the author, such heathen are not saved unconditionally. Renewing grace is adequate to all their needs, but if they wilfully reject the good and choose the evil, grace, though all-sufficient, does not deliver them from sin. This sound proposition, however, does not accord with the doctrine that Christ, "by the Spirit, impregnates their unconscious souls with the virtue of His death, and unites them to Himself, without condition. And this shows, as perhaps nothing else could show, that our salvation is all and altogether of grace—a sweet, pure gift of Divine love." If infants dying in infancy, according to the ethical constitution

\* *Presb. Rev.* IV., p. 578.

of humanity, cannot but develop into moral agents,—a truth which I dare not presume so able a thinker as Dr. Prentiss will deny,—their status after natural death will be like the status of all others who die innocent of the rejection of the gospel; and to them no less than to the adult heathen, we are required to apply the broad scriptural principle affirmed by Dr. Prentiss, that “nothing keeps any soul from the gracious operation of His infinite love and pity but its own wilful choice of evil and refusal of the good.” Having in themselves the perverse tendencies of inherited moral evil, when the Lamb of God, their atoning sacrifice and glorified mediator, sheds upon their opening souls the light of life, they will be saved if they choose the supreme good and reject the evil; but if they wilfully choose moral evil and reject the supreme good, the possibility of which cannot, either on scriptural or psychological grounds, be denied, how can they be saved?

If we recognize the scriptural truth that the second advent will be the final and decisive epoch in the history both of our fallen race and of the Christian redemption, and allow this truth to have its legitimate modifying force in forming doctrinal opinions concerning soteriological and eschatological questions; and if we divest our minds of the misleading influence of the monstrous notion that infants, dying in infancy, continue from age to age to be unconscious infants, we shall have much less difficulty in reaching some consistent and satisfying doctrine on this perplexing problem. Each newborn infant envelops most solemn eternal possibilities for weal or woe. If he lives, and grows into childhood and manhood, his moral and religious character, here and hereafter, is problematical. Whether he will be a godly man and share the blessings of redemption, can be known by his parents only as he unfolds his life, and becomes a consistent follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. If a newborn babe does not survive unconscious infancy, the same life-problem is to be historically solved. The Holy Spirit of Christ never works magically, no more after natural death than before that event. Man's ethical life is autonomic, whether unfolded

in the earthly or in the trans-earthly period of his existence. Renewing grace cannot violate manhood. Sin perverts, but grace conserves, freedom. Created in God's image, but distorted by moral evil, man is upheld in the integrity of manhood by the unchangeable Will of God, whether that will be active in man's constitution, or in the dealings of Providence, or in the glorious economy of redemption. Holy Scripture, accordingly, is utterly silent in regard to the final state of all the dead who die in ignorance of the gospel and innocent of the decisive sin of unbelief. Much as we may desire to know their final status more definitely, and unsatisfying as our ignorance and the silence of Scripture may be to parents bereft of an innocent babe, we cannot propound a doctrine which contravenes both the mystery of human freedom and an essential principle of Christianity. If persons in the trans-earthly age who have departed this life in unconscious infancy, wilfully reject the supreme good, it cannot be otherwise than that according to the very nature of divine love, they must experience the same destiny as all others who, having on earth grown from infancy to manhood, choose ungodliness and resist the constraining love of Jesus Christ.

Natural death does not essentially change the conditions of the problem relatively to infants. If on earth they survive infancy, no one can predict with certainty that from the heart they will in youth or manhood accept the Saviour. If they do not survive unconscious infancy and develop into moral agents after death, no one can foretell that they will open their hearts to renewing grace. They may, and we are justified in cherishing the hope that they will; but, reasoning in the light of human freedom, we ought not to shut our eyes to the possible contrary alternative, that they may refuse the good and choose the evil. Our Lord does not through His Spirit deliver any from sin and condemnation by the magical exercise of His grace, either here or hereafter.

## BAPTISM RELATIVELY TO INFANT SALVATION.

At this stage of our inquiry a new phase of the general problem claims attention. All infants do not occupy the same religious status on earth. Will there be a corresponding difference in the transearthly age? If the salvation of infants who die in infancy depends upon their acceptance of Jesus Christ, and if the mystery of personal freedom disqualifies us to affirm that they will certainly by faith yield to His renewing grace, the question is legitimate whether all infants after death will develop into personal freedom on the same religious plane? Will the children of Christians and the children of the heathen wake up under the influence of the same spiritual tendencies? Will the baptized and the unbaptized stand in the same relation to the Mediator?

The authority of Augustine, the great theologian of the Latin church in the fifth century, introduced the doctrine that baptism fixes a broad dividing line between baptized and unbaptized infants. All baptized infants are by the spiritual virtue of this sacrament saved, and all unbaptized infants dying in infancy are not saved. Dr. Prentiss brings out the mighty influence of this Augustinian idea in the history of theology, and traces its controlling power down to our age. It survived the Protestant Reformation; and by the decretal system of Calvinism the application of the principle was even circumscribed; the saving virtue of baptism being confined exclusively to elect infants. Baptized infants not included within the decree of unconditional election derive no spiritual benefit from the sacrament. From the silence of Dr. Prentiss, I am led to infer that he concedes the validity of the inference drawn by Augustine from his baptismal premises. If holy baptism be the sacrament of regeneration and the seal of forgiveness of sins, it would follow as a legitimate consequence, so I apprehend the drift of the historical argument, that the unbaptized who die in infancy do not attain to the state of blessedness.

The validity of this inference I cannot concede. If we accept the New Testament doctrine on the spiritual virtue of baptism, we are not shut up to the Augustinian inference. Admitting that by baptism infants become members of the covenant of grace, it does not follow that unbaptized infants dying in infancy are lost.

The idea of the work of saving grace held by Augustine was largely magical. According to his conception the grace of God through appointed means wrought its saving effects irresistibly and unconditionally. The human factor in the process of personal salvation was overlooked, if not denied. A broad line was indeed drawn between believers and unbelievers; and Augustine taught and enforced the necessity of believing in Jesus Christ. But the obligation of personal faith, or the necessity of the self-appropriation of Christ by the free activity of the individual, did not duly enter into his construction of the doctrine concerning personal salvation. The love and mercy of God in Jesus Christ was the chief and controlling, perhaps the exclusive factor. Whether infants were saved or not turned solely on the action of divine grace.

This magical conception respecting the operation of grace reigned through the mediæval ages, and obtained expression especially in the dogma concerning the sacraments. As formulated by the council of Trent, Baptism and the holy Eucharist work their intended effects *ex opere operato*. The receptive state and the self-appropriating action of personal faith is not a condition either of their objective virtue or of their subjective efficacy. This magical character attaches to all the services of the Roman church, to penances and prayers as really as to the ministrations of the priest.

The obligation of personal faith is the distinguishing characteristic of the Protestant Reformation. Never before was this Christian principle, which is taught so unequivocally in the New Testament and especially in the Pauline epistles, definitely asserted, nor had it ever clearly entered into the Christian consciousness respecting the way of salvation. Since that epoch

the idea of faith has wrought with the force of a creative principle in the different branches of Evangelical Protestantism. Nevertheless the ethical significance of personal faith has not had free scope in the construction of the Evangelical doctrine on regeneration and the forgiveness of sins. Opinions respecting the operation of saving grace prevalent in theology, in the pulpit, and among Christian people, have been largely magical. We need no better illustration of the persistency with which the magical element in theology and practical religion has perpetuated itself than the decree of unconditional election. The elect, whether infants dying in infancy or adults, are saved, according to the decretal system, by virtue solely of their election; repentance, faith, and obedience being spiritual effects wrought by electing grace. The non-elect, whether infants or adults, were lost as a consequence of preterition, if not of foreordination to eternal death. They are not lost, according to this system, because they refuse the supreme good in Jesus Christ and choose sin, but because the unconditional decree of election does not embrace them, and they are thus left to perish in their spiritual helplessness. Had any of them been among the elect they would have been saved by irresistible grace, notwithstanding their natural aversion to the supreme good and their natural preference of moral evil. Neither in the case of the saved nor of the lost does the autonomy of the human will enter constructively into the conception of their final destiny.

Unconditional election has now lost its hold on the majority of Calvinistic pulpits, and its controlling influence in many Calvinistic theological seminaries. But the reaction has not destroyed the magical element. It has a tough life: and survives in spite of important dogmatic changes. As before, the magical asserted itself in the firm belief that all elect infants must certainly be saved, their personal choice not being taken into account, so now the same element is manifest in the belief that all infants dying in infancy are by the infinite mercy of God certainly saved, and saved without condition; the difference of personal character for good or for evil, due to moral

agency, being left out of view altogether. Whether elect infants only, or all infants without exception are saved by infinite grace unconditionally, the principle is the same. In both cases the theory of salvation contravenes the God-given prerogatives of moral agency. A child is identical with himself in the earthly and in the transearthly period. A moral agent here, he must be, unless his ethical constitution be invaded, a moral agent hereafter; and his actual relation to Jesus Christ, his spiritual character and destiny will depend no less on the free activity of his will after death than the moral and spiritual life of a child on earth depends on the right action of his will.

The force of the magical element in religious thought appears in the prevalent contrary opinions respecting the virtue of holy baptism. If we assume that there is saving virtue in baptism, or that by baptism we are buried with Christ into His death, then it is held two consequences must follow logically: the one that baptized infants dying in infancy are unconditionally saved; the other, that the unbaptized are unconditionally lost. In reality, however, neither consequence is a logical inference from the spiritual virtue of baptism. Baptism does not work its effects *ex opere operato*. That is the magical doctrine of Romanism; with which nominally and in theory Evangelical Protestantism has no sympathy; yet in our religious life, especially in current notions of salvation by grace, the *opus operatum* principle has silently a dominating influence. To escape the logical consequences which, it is commonly assumed, must follow from the spiritual virtue of this initiatory ordinance, baptism is resolved into an outward sign; then, according to this purely symbolical conception, the sacrament has no significance whatever relatively to the moral and spiritual life of an infant after death.

But if we divest our reflections on infant salvation of the silent influence of the magical in the virtue of baptism, we may recognize a real connection between baptism and the salvation of infants. A baptized infant is a member of the covenant of grace. Baptism is the divine initiatory act. A



member of Christ's spiritual household, the blessings of redemption are sealed to him. But as he grows into youth and manhood it is an undecided question, whether he will accept his spiritual birthright, and by his believing act make these blessings his personal possession, or, like Esau, sell his birthright for a mess of pottage. Many who are baptized in infancy reject the loving Saviour who has taken them up into His arms and blessed them. This fact proves nothing against the spiritual virtue of baptism, no more than the rejection of the gospel proves that there is no spiritual virtue in the Word of God. The only thing which is demonstrated by the rejection of the spiritual birthright sealed in baptism, or of the gospel when proclaimed with power to adults is this, that the self-determination of the will is a potent but mysterious factor in the history of every individual. The baptized infant may become an ungodly man; and the unbaptized infant may yield to the power of the gospel and become an humble Christian. Some children who have received no moral training nevertheless become good men; and others who are wisely brought up and well-trained become bad men. The cases are parallel. But certainly the immoral life of some men who were brought up under good discipline is no argument to show that there is no virtue in the moral training of children.

Baptized infants dying in infancy enter the transearthly period in covenant fellowship with God; and they share all the blessings of redemption as really there as members of the covenant who on earth grow from infancy to manhood, share those blessings here. The church of Christ is a spiritual community, which embraces all her members among the living and the dead,—those who have departed this life no less than those who are in the earthly body. The dissolving forces of natural death do not touch the vital bonds of union and fellowship binding together the children of this spiritual household.

These two periods of human existence are analogous. Baptized infants surviving infancy develop into moral agency in the bosom of the Christian community; and they occupy that

gracious relation to their Lord and Saviour which baptism establishes. If they die in infancy they wake up into consciousness in the transearthy age, and become moral agents in the same covenant fellowship with Christ. They stand there among those who have received the sealing ordinance of God. But as they develop into moral agency, in order to realize for themselves the benefit of the covenant, they must, by an act of their own, accept Christ. They do not attain to final salvation simply in consequence of their baptism, but because from the heart they receive Him into whose death they were baptized. If any do not receive Him; if not true to their covenant obligations, they cannot escape the condemnation of those who on earth develop into manhood in the bosom of the Christian family and the church, yet refuse the love of Christ and despise their birthright.

Unbaptized infants surviving infancy, though they have not been, by the initiatory sacrament, received into the fellowship of the Christian community, may hear the gospel, receive Christ by true faith, and become His consistent followers. As a rule, the best church-members grow up under the daily training of the Christian household, and under the moulding influence of the Church day by day, year by year, from childhood to manhood. But the gospel is also aggressive. It lays hold of multitudes who have grown up in irreligion and wickedness, and brings them into the fold of Christ. If we reason from the conditions of the earthly period to the conditions of the transearthy period, we have ground to believe that unbaptized infants dying in infancy may, as they develop into moral agency, respond positively to the manifestation of truth, receive Christ freely, and share the benefits of His redemptive work. They cannot be lost simply because on earth they were not baptized, as the opposite class will not be saved as the necessary consequence of their baptism. Personal salvation implies the choosing and the doing of the supreme good; and personal condemnation implies the actual refusal of the supreme good and devotion to sin. The supposition that a person who

accepts the Mediator may be lost, or that a person who refuses to accept the Mediator may be saved, is self-contradictory. The reverse of this is equally untenable: to assume that any are lost who do not refuse the supreme good. Analogy may therefore justify us in presuming that the difference between the spiritual prospects of these two classes of infants developing into moral agents in the transearthy age, may resemble the difference between the spiritual prospects of these two classes when they survive infancy on earth.

To these eschatological questions we may apply the argument of St. Paul from circumcision relatively to the acceptance by God of the Jew and the Gentile. His argument, *mutatis mutandis*, might be represented thus: Baptism indeed profiteth, if thou be a doer of the law: but if thou be a transgressor of the law, thy baptism is become unbaptism. If, therefore, the unbaptism keep the ordinance of the law, shall not his unbaptism be reckoned for baptism? and shall not the unbaptism which is by nature, if it fulfill the law, judge thee, who with the letter and baptism art a transgressor of the law? for he is not a Christian who is one outwardly, neither is that baptism, which is outward: but he is a Christian, which is one inwardly; and baptism is that of the heart, in the spirit, not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God. What advantage then hath the Christian? or what is the profit of baptism? much every way: first of all, that they were entrusted with the oracles of God.\*

Our Lord came to "His own;" His salvation was designed primarily for the Jews, His covenant people; but the Gentiles were not excluded. Though ignorant of Jehovah, and standing outside of the Old Testament communion, the Christ was designed also for them, and they were accessible to His grace. The gospel was the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first and also to the Greek. First the Jew, then the Greek. This relative difference between the covenant people and other nations runs through the whole New

\* Rom. 2: 25-29; 3: 1, 2.

Testament. The principle is applicable to baptized infants in contradistinction to those who are not baptized. Reasoning from analogy, we may say that the relative difference between these two classes of infants when they develop into personal freedom after death, and are confronted by the manifestation of their Lord, corresponds to the difference of position between the Jew and the Greek when the gospel was first preached to the covenanted and the uncovenanted peoples of the world.

#### UNIVERSAL MANIFESTATION OF CHRIST.

The argument I have been pursuing in regard to the salvability of infants dying in infancy has proceeded on the assumption that there is a manifestation of Jesus, the Mediator, in the transearthly age, as truly as on earth. This article will be too extended if I proceed to examine the teaching of the New Testament on the subject. I must therefore confine myself to only a few statements.

1. That Jesus entered into the region of the dead is a Christian truth which is clearly taught both in the gospels and in the epistles. To what end He entered this realm is likewise definitely stated. Jesus went among the dead to preach the gospel. "For this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."\* Other passages are of the same import.

2. All who read the New Testament attentively cannot but see that Christ sustains a relation to mankind which is universal. He is the head over "all things." Created intelligences in heaven, on earth, and under the earth are to confess that He is Lord.† No part of God's ethical household is excepted. All worlds are destined to witness the self-manifestation of the only Mediator between God and the entire creation.

3. There is no passage in the New Testament which limits the proclamation of the gospel exclusively to men living in the earthly period of their history.

\* 1 Peter iv. 6.

† Phil. 2: 10, 11.

4. Jesus, the Son of Man, the only Mediator, will be the judge of *all men*. So the ecumenical creeds confess. So our Lord Himself teaches in His parables. All nations shall be gathered before Him when at the final day He shall come to judge the living and the dead. Not only Jews; not only Christian nations; but *all nations*;\* the countless millions of men who lived and died before Jesus was born; also, the countless millions who have lived and died since the Christian era. Observe—that none are approved because they have obeyed the law written in their hearts, and none are condemned because they have broken this law; but those on His right hand inherit the kingdom because they have done service to Himself, and those on His left hand hear the sentence: “Depart from me,” because they have not ministered unto Him. How can He approve some for the reason that they have ministered unto Him, and condemn others for the reason that they have neglected Him, if the Son of Man was never brought into direct communication with them?

5. We know that our Lord has commanded His servants to proclaim the gospel to all nations on the face of the globe. We know also that in the final heaven there will be a manifestation of Himself in glory to His saints; and to unbelievers, suffering final retribution, there will be a revelation of His displeasure and wrath. Is it supposable that during the progress of the intermediate ages preceding the second coming there will be no revelation nor proclamation of Himself? On this supposition the intermediate ages would not be in accord with the general divine method.

In the article of Dr. Prentiss I find a beautiful passage which is in accord with the idea of the universal manifestation of Christ, though it occurs in different logical relations. The passage I quote:

“How is the new, sinless life, which is freely given them in Christ, developed into the measure of the status of His fulness? for we surely cannot dream that they will remain always in the

\* Matt. 25: 31-46.

blank ignorance and helplessness of their earthly condition. What is the intermediate state—that unseen spiritual economy—in which, from being unconscious infants of an hour or a day, for example, they grow up into full-orbed Christian manhood? Do they become, like ‘the spirits of just men made perfect,’ by pure miracle, by a single stroke of Omnipotence? or do they go into eternity, as to a great training-school—elect charity-scholars, to say, of the Omnipresent Divine Master, who, having purchased them here by His own blood, educates them there in the life everlasting? And what is their peculiar relation to the other and elder members of His mystical body in its triumphant, glorified state?”

#### NO PROBATION.

But the idea of an universal proclamation of the Gospel, both on earth and during the intermediate ages, does not imply a probationary state after death. Dr. Prentiss handles this branch of the general discussion from the right point of view and in masterly style. He sketches the history of this theological term from the beginning of the last century onward, and emphasizes especially the influence of Bishop Butler, to whom, “more than to any other man, we are probably indebted for the peculiar meaning and general use of the term *probation*, as expressing the distinctive character of this life.”

Scripturally speaking, sinful men are not on trial here, nor will they be hereafter. By nature, and in consequence of transgression, all are under condemnation. In Christ they have been redeemed. True, the redemption can avail only for those who by faith receive Christ; and in this respect it may be said that men govern their own destiny. It is an unsolved problem in the case of every man, when Christ challenges his confidence and love, whether he will yield a positive response to the challenge. But this problem does not involve probation in the sense of Bishop Butler, nor in the sense in which the term is commonly used.\*

\* I quote a discriminating passage from the article of Dr. Prentiss: “To the natural, unregenerate man, then, this life is a grand spiritual opportunity—a

Moral probation implies that the subject is constitutionally in a normal state and ethically good, possessing adequate ability to sustain a right relationship to God in the face of all solicitations to the contrary from the kingdom of darkness. Adam, as fashioned by the hand of the Creator, was in a state of probation when assailed by the tempter. So also was the Lord Jesus when He passed through His threefold temptation in the wilderness. That ordeal was for Him a probation. But of no other members of our race can probation legitimately be predicated.

In some subordinate spheres of life men may be said to be on trial. But they are not on trial in their relation to God. Coming into the world with a sinful nature, they when left to themselves freely embrace the moral evil which is in them. They have no power to determine by their own strength, whether their nature shall be normal or abnormal. On the other hand, the great work of redemption in Christ does not depend on the will or conduct of men. The redemption is the fruit of God's infinite love to guilty sinners, and in Christ they are the objects of His saving grace. If saved, their salvation is not due to the fact that they have passed successfully through the ordeal of personal virtue; but their salvation is due to the infinite grace of God in Christ, of which by faith they have become individually the subjects. All that may be said according to Scripture, either of infants or

dispensation of Divine love and mercy—for the wilful neglect or loss of which he must reap the consequences in the next world. We may, indeed, call this opportunity a probation; but does it not lack some of the vital elements of a real, complete probation? That would seem to involve a certain freedom, an autonomy of will scarcely consistent with the spiritual bondage and alienation from God, which is a distinctive mark of our natural state. So long as a man is unconverted and out of Christ, what is the moral trial he is undergoing? Is it a trial which can issue in eternal life in virtue of any power of his own, unaided by special grace? Is he not, as was said before, "*condemned already*," "*lost*" beyond all hope, except through the intervention of the infinite mercy of God in Jesus Christ? Unless he seize his spiritual opportunity, and, renouncing all other ground of confidence, humbly accept the salvation fully offered in the Gospel, what would a thousand years of such probation as belongs to his natural state avail him? *Presb. Rev.*, Vol. IV., p. 572.

adults, who die innocent of the conscious rejection of Jesus Christ, is that the relations which on entering the intermediate realm, they sustain on the one hand to the violated law of God, and on the other to the gracious Redeemer, resemble the attitude of infants and adults on earth, who have not wilfully rejected the supreme good.\* To such the proclamation of the Gospel, there is reason to believe, will come with power and in demonstration of the Spirit.

But there is a great gulf fixed between the Redeemer and all those who by the wilful refusal of the supreme good manifest in Him, have by their own personal activity been wedded to sin. To them the manifestation of the supreme good as in the earthly so in the transearthly period of their history will be the savor of death unto death. Strengthened in their moral perverseness by life-long aversion to redemption they will continue to do the evil and hate the good. Judging from our knowledge of man's moral constitution and in the light of Holy Scripture there is no warrant for the opinion that those

\* In the two chapters of his *Analogy on Probation*, Bishop Butler designedly ignores both man's apostasy and the necessity of regeneration by the Holy Spirit. Descending to the level of the objectors to revealed religion, he reasons with them on their own ground against their objections to the doctrine of possible future misery, by setting forth the fact that the natural and moral economy of the present life is open to the same objections. The happiness of a man in old age depends on the right use in childhood and youth of his own powers and his opportunities. If he contracts habits of vice, manhood and old age will be unhappy. Analogous to this connection between youth and manhood, is the connection between our present life and the future life. As regards the happiness of our future state, the present life is a probation, just as youth is a probation relatively to the well-being of old age.

This argument was adequate to the purposes of Bishop Butler; the whole design of the first part of his *Analogy* being to silence the objectors to the doctrine concerning the misery of the wicked hereafter, by showing that the same objections lie against the present life. But the argument does not represent Christian ideas. The doctrine of future rewards and punishments, in its relation to the present life as taught in the New Testament, proceeds on totally different premises. When we designate the history of men on earth in its relation to their condition after death by using the term *probation*, we speak from the view-point of natural religion, assuming with Bishop Butler, that we have adequate power, if we will, to fit ourselves for future blessedness



who turn against Jesus Christ on earth will hereafter turn from the selfishness and wickedness which by their own volition have become the controlling law of their spiritual existence.

Nor are we justified in cherishing a different sentiment in regard to many of the heathen. The language of St. Paul in the first and second chapters of his Epistle to the Romans has most solemn significance in regard to the future moral character of the Gentiles: "That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them. For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. When they knew God, they glorified Him not as God, neither were thankful; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do those things which are not convenient; being filled with all unrighteousness; full of envy, murder, malignity; haters of God, proud, inventors of evil things, covenant breakers, implacable, unmerciful: who knowing the judgment of God, that they which commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them. God will render to every man according to his deeds: unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil; of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For as many as have sinned without law shall perish without law: and as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law."

The Apostle recognizes a decided moral difference as between Jew and Jew, so also between Greek and Greek. Gen-

tiles show the work of the law written in their hearts; they are a law unto themselves. Some of them do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness. They knowingly commit things which are worthy of death. On such will rest the indignation and wrath of God. When they pass through the article of death, and are for the first time confronted by the manifestation of holy love in Jesus Christ, having by a conscious life of willful wickedness resisted the light of God shining in them, they will also resist the more glorious light shining in the Redeemer. Having sown to the flesh, they will of the flesh reap corruption. This opinion respecting the future state of the wicked among the heathen is sustained both by the word of God and by the laws of our ethical being. The persistent doing of wrong contrary to conscience, strengthens aversion to the right and the good, and becomes a fixed habit of self-perversion which bears fruit after its kind. As on earth so hereafter such heathen will love sin, and work out their own destruction with greediness.

There may be, probably there is, another class among the heathen, who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality. They have not the revealed law; but they do by nature the things contained in the law. When, after death, this opposite class of heathen for the first time behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, it is scriptural to believe that they may yield a positive response to the gospel. On earth they were seekers after God. They preferred the right to the wrong, the good to the evil. They yearned after deliverance from their abnormal condition. By patient continuance in well-doing they sought for spiritual glory. Having cultivated living sympathy with truth and righteousness, thus also aversion to sin and evil, they will be good soil on which the seed of Christian truth will fall, and they may bear the fruit of faith in the Mediator and of subjection to His holy authority. Glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.

But neither in man's ethical life nor in Scripture is there a warrant for the theory that those heathen will attain to salvation in Christ who on earth have persisted in violating the law written in their hearts, and have changed the truth of God into a lie. Philosophy and revelation both sustain the awful belief that, in the transearthly period of human history, there is an impassable gulf between every soul of man that doeth evil, and every man that worketh good—between them that obey the truth, and them that obey unrighteousness. For whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap. The moral and spiritual character which a man developed and established in the earthly period, whether living under the revealed law of God, or without law, will be the moral and spiritual character in which by his own self-determination he will persist in the transearthly period.

There is, then, no probation here nor hereafter either for infants or adults. All unregenerate men die under the abnormal action of sin; and all need the saving virtue of Christ's redemption. Without it they are hopeless. But through the preaching of the gospel there will be a manifestation of the Mediator to all, both to infants dying in infancy and to the heathen. This manifestation of the Mediator is real and mighty here; it will also be real and mighty hereafter. So far forth there is hope for all who have not, by the renunciation of the supreme good, made final and irreversible choice of moral evil. This hope embraces those heathen who obey the law written in their hearts, and by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality. Eschatology, however, can go no further. An unconditional judgment cannot be pronounced. For personal freedom also is a factor which enters into the process of human salvation; and we cannot with any certainty predict the manner in which infants developing after death into moral agency will respond to the renewing grace of God. One principle, however, stands immovably. All who believe in Jesus Christ will share the full benefit of His great redemption. Moreover, all the Christian agencies of the Church,

which ennoble, sanctify, and spiritualize the natural and ethical life of infancy, strengthens the hope that from the heart they will freely receive Him who is the Way, and the Truth, and the Life.

To sum up the results of these inquiries I conclude that, judging in the light we now have on the ways of God and the history of man, eschatology is shut up to the assertion of this negative thesis: It cannot be said either that all baptized infants dying in infancy will be saved, and all the unbaptized lost; or that elect infants only will be saved, whilst the non-elect perish; or that through the infinite mercy of God infants universally who die in infancy, baptized or unbaptized, whether born of Christian or heathen parents, will participate in the benefits of redemption. The endeavor by ignoring the relative autonomy of the human will, to maintain either proposition, positive or negative, virtually resolves divine grace into divine magic.

No unconditional decree excludes infants from eternal blessedness. Nor are they disqualified merely for the want of baptism. The solution of this life-problem turns on the character of their response to redeeming love. When they develop into personality and the necessity of self-determination toward God arises, will they or will they not disqualify and exclude themselves by refusing the reconciliation and the supreme good addressing them in the only Mediator, our Lord Jesus Christ?

Infant salvation is a speculative subject of solemn practical interest; and I have approached it with hesitation and no little diffidence. It has engaged my earnest studies for years; and this paper embodies some of the results. Whilst I cannot do otherwise than dissent from Dr. Prentiss, especially from his fundamental hypothesis and his method of argument, I thank the respected author for his thoughtful and suggestive article. It is a valuable contribution to the science of the problem. Possibly after still further study I shall feel constrained to criticise some of my own statements; there may also be some

corollaries fairly deducible which I do not accept; but for the present the Christ-idea in eschatology does not allow me to diverge into a different line of thought and belief. The leading positions I have taken seem to me to be warranted by sound exegesis, ethical philosophy and by the Christological conception of human history.

## II.

### THE MEANING OF THE CROSS.

BY REV. WM. RUPP.

*The Cross in the Light of To-Day.* By W. W. McLane, D. D. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. 1883.

THIS is an interesting book on an important subject. In ten chapters the author treats of Christ as the Mediator, suffering for sin, the sacrifice for sin, the propitiation for sin, the power of God unto salvation, the medium of forgiveness, the author of justification and of sanctification, the preserver of law and government, and the King over all. The book is not designed merely for professional theologians, but for intelligent Christians of all classes. It is thoughtful and earnest, as well as reverent and devout, and the unprejudiced reader cannot fail to derive from it both profit and instruction. It is Scriptural in argument and style, free from metaphysical subtleties, has no direct polemical aim, and is in the line of the higher Christological and ethical thought of the present time.

The peculiarity of this style of thought, we are told, is that it views, not the crucifixion of Christ, but Christ crucified as the Saviour of sinners, and regards salvation as consisting, not in the satisfaction of the claims of the law by the punishment of the innocent for the guilty, but in such a change in the life of the sinner as shall bring him into right moral relation to the law.\* The purpose of the coming of Christ, according to Dr. McLane, was not to produce an effect upon God, but rather to produce an effect upon men,—not to reconcile God to men, but to reconcile men to God. And the cross was not lifted up in order that it might cast its influences backward into the Divine

\* Pp. 222 and 227.

heart from which Christ came, but that it might cast its influences forward into the hearts of men to which Christ came. The design of the cross was not primarily to adjust claims of law, and government and justice, and so render it possible for God to forgive men,—but rather to draw men, convicted of sin and repentant, to God, and so render it possible for them to be forgiven.\* This may suffice to give the reader an idea of the principle and spirit of the book before us, which, though it may not be supposed to utter the last word on the great theme of which it treats, deserves, nevertheless, to be welcomed as an earnest and able effort to throw new light upon that theme.†

We do not propose, in the following pages, to review this book in detail, but rather to make it the occasion of a free discussion of the subject in our own way. In doing so we may sometimes borrow the language or thought of Dr. McLane's book, but in such case we shall always try to be careful to give proper credit.

The suffering and death of Christ have always been regarded as standing in an important relation to the redemption of men; but, in respect to the precise nature of this relation, Christian theology is not yet agreed. In the progress of theological science, various theories of the atonement have been developed, but of these none has as yet gained the general consent of the church. The question as to the relation of the cross of Christ to the salvation of men, therefore, still waits for a satisfactory answer, and is at this time pressing for an answer with a force that cannot be denied or resisted. Faith, here as elsewhere, is

\* Pp. 21-23.

† The author was a minister of the Presbyterian Church when the book was written, but its publication has cost him his position in that church. He was tried for heresy by the Presbytery of Steubenville, Ohio, and convicted. He appealed from the decision of the Presbytery to the General Assembly at Saratoga, but the case went against him there, and he has since passed into the Congregationalist Church, bearing with him, however, the testimony of many of his late brethren to his high Christian character and sweet Christian spirit, qualities of which his book also affords evidence.

in order to knowledge; and the Christian mind can not rest satisfied until it has fully penetrated the object of its faith by the light of the understanding.

The earliest theory of the atonement, as is well known, regarded the suffering of Christ mainly as a transaction with the devil. This theory assumed several distinct forms. Some, starting from those passages of Scripture in which salvation is viewed in its negative aspect as a deliverance from the power of evil, considered the suffering of Christ as a battle with Satan, and His death on the cross as the final victory, in which the head of the serpent was bruised and the dominion of the devil destroyed. Others regarded the death of Christ as a ransom paid to the devil for releasing the souls of men whom, having conquered by seduction, he held in lawful captivity; and still others viewed it as a trick on the part of God, by which the devil was outwitted, the latter being willing to exchange the souls of men for the pre-eminently excellent soul of Christ, but afterwards unable to hold it on account of its divinity, which he had not perceived.

This theory originated in the Patristic age; and, though it was opposed by Athanasius and several other distinguished Fathers, yet it continued to be the prevailing theory down to the age of Scholasticism, and the last echoes of it had not yet died away in the time of the Reformation. But in the eleventh century Anselm of Canterbury propounded the theory of vicarious satisfaction or substitutionary punishment, in which the claims of divine justice are substituted for the claims of the devil, and the suffering and death of Christ are regarded as a full legal equivalent for the penalty which was due for the sins of all mankind. This is the theory which the Reformers accepted, without any examination or inquiry, from the theology of the Mediæval Church, and which, with waning influence and failing success, is still struggling to maintain itself against the advancing religious thought of the present age.

Anselm's theory starts with the conception of sin as *debt*. To commit sin, he says, is nothing else than to withhold from



God His due (*debitum*); and to withhold from God His due is to dishonor Him, not, indeed, by depriving Him of His honor objectively considered, for that is inviolable, but by disturbing the order and harmony of the universe. This debt God can not remit gratuitously, for to do so would be to allow more liberty to unrighteousness than to righteousness. This would be repugnant to justice. God's justice requires that the debt should be paid, that is, that satisfaction should be made by the payment of the penalty which was due for the violation of His honor. This satisfaction must be made by man, for he is the guilty party. But man in his own nature could never make it, for it must be of infinite value, or, as Anselm says, "greater than all that is not God," because the debt incurred by violating God's infinite majesty is infinitely great. It can, therefore, only be made by one who is greater than all that is not God, or one who is Himself God, and yet at the same time also man, that is, one who is God-man. He must be man, in order that the penalty may fall upon man, and God, in order that the satisfaction rendered may be sufficiently great. Such an one is Christ, who suffered and died in the sinner's stead. Christ, as being sinless, was not under obligation to die; and in nevertheless submitting to death, He acquired an infinite merit, which He does not need for Himself, and which is, therefore, set to the account of those whom He came to redeem. The sufferings and death of Christ are, therefore, penal in their nature. He suffered what was equivalent to the punishment that was due for the sins of all mankind. Such in its essential features is the legal satisfaction theory of the atonement which bears the name of Anselm.\* As commonly understood and held now, Dr. McLane states it briefly and pithily in the following words: "Our sins were imputed to Christ, and He was punished as a guilty person; His sufferings and righteousness are imputed to us, and we are treated as righteous persons."†

This theory was controverted in the Scholastic period by

\* Comp. Hagenbach's *History of Doctrine*, § 180.

† *Cross in the Light of To-Day*, p. 196.

Abelard, who emphasized the moral influence of Christ's suffering, and declared the love of Christ to be the principle of redemption. The Son of God, he taught, took upon Himself our nature, and persevered unto death in teaching (*instituendo*) us by word and example, that by the exhibition of such love He might call forth love in us; and our redemption consists in that supreme love which is excited in us by the passion of Christ, and which frees us from the bondage of sin and obtains for us the liberty of the sons of God, so that we may serve God rather from love than from fear. Baur states the difference between Anselm and Abelard in regard to the doctrine of atonement as follows: "The one considered the last ground of it to be the Divine justice requiring an infinite equivalent for the infinite guilt of sin, that is, a necessity founded in the nature of God; the other held it to be the free grace of God, which, by kindling love in the breast of man, blots out sin and with sin its guilt."\* Peter Lombard, the master of sentences, agreed with Abelard in viewing the atonement from a psychologico-moral standpoint. "How," he asks, "are we delivered from our sins by the death of Christ?" And his answer is, "Because, as the apostle says, God commendeth His love toward us, that is, God's wonderful love toward us is made apparent in this, that He delivered His own Son unto death for us sinners; and we are, by the exhibition of this pledge of His love, incited to love God, and through this we are justified. The death of Christ justifies us, because, by means thereof, love is excited in our hearts."†

Other views also appeared in the same age, as, for instance, that of Bernard of Clairvaux, who laid stress upon the idea of a mystical union between Christ and those for whom He died, an idea which is found also in Thomas Aquinas; and the view of Duns Scotus, who taught substantially the *acceptilation* or *governmental* theory of later times, namely, that the suffering of Christ was not a real but an accepted and nominal equivalent for the sins of the world. But these views exercised no wide

\* Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, § 181.

† *Ibid.*

or permanent influence. The theory of Anselm was more in harmony with the spirit of the age than any other. That age was legalistic in its whole tendency. Christianity was then defined as a *New Law*, and religious conceptions and sentiments closely resembled those of legalistic Judaism. The spirit of the age had more affinity for the penal theory of Anselm than for the moral theory of Abelard or of Peter Lombard. And it is, therefore, somewhat surprising to see Dr. Shedd lauding Anselm's theory as eminently Biblical and evangelical, while he insinuates suspicion in regard to the moral and religious life of Abelard, who refused to accept it.\* No doubt, the religious life of the two men had something to do with their respective theories; but in that regard we do not know that Anselm had any advantage over his opponent; for while the career of Abelard was not free from blame, it must be remembered that the early life of Anselm also was spent in dissipation and sin; and, if it be true, for instance, that the early life of Augustine had much to do with his extreme development of the doctrine of predestination, it may be that the early life of Anselm also had something to do with his development of the doctrine of the atonement.

In the time of the Reformation there was not much serious difference of opinion in regard to this doctrine, and therefore but little discussion of it. The Reformers, it has been said, were too busy with other matters to devote much attention to this subject. They were principally occupied with questions relating to the subjective appropriation of salvation, and had no occasion particularly to examine the objective ground of salvation. As they received the doctrine of the Trinity and of the person of Christ, so they received without consideration the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the atonement, agreeing with the Romanists that the death of Christ is a legal satisfaction for sin of infinite value, and differing with them only in regard to the condition on which the individual can be made to share the benefit of this satisfaction. On several points, indeed, there

\* *History of Christian Doctrine*, Vol. II., p. 287.

was a further development of the Anselmic doctrine. In the first place, a distinction was made between the *active* and *passive* obedience of Christ, the former consisting of His perfect obedience to law by which He fulfilled all righteousness, the latter, in His suffering and death, by which He made expiation for sin. And, in the second place, this latter was made to include also the pains and torments of hell (*mors eterna*), so that Christ suffered to the utmost all the pains and all the torments which all men would have had to suffer forever, if Christ had not come and suffered in their stead. "God has cast all sin of all men upon His Son," says Luther. "Then forthwith comes the law accusing Him and saying, 'Here find I this one among sinners, yea, who hath taken all men's sins upon Himself and bears them, and I see in the whole world besides not another sin except upon Him alone; therefore shall He suffer for it, and die the death upon the cross.'"\*

This theory, as already said, gained an entrance into Protestant confessions and theology without any serious challenge in the beginning. It has, however, at no time commanded the entire confidence of all Christian thinkers. The Socinians rejected it and delivered it some hard blows; but their objections, of course, lost much of their weight with orthodox theologians in consequence of their erroneous views on other subjects, and perhaps for this reason never received the consideration which they deserved. The Arminians or Remonstrants of Holland also rejected it, or at least so modified it as to eviscerate it of its main substance. Grotius propounded what has since been called the *governmental theory*, which regards the suffering of Christ not as a payment of the penalty of human sin, but rather as an example of punishment designed to preserve the divine government, and to deter its subjects from sinning. He taught that the divine law, which threatens the punishment of the sinner, is simply a positive enactment of the divine will, which God, as a sovereign, can relax or execute at pleasure. There is nothing in God to pre-

\* *Cross in the Light of To-Day*, p. 210.

vent the free remission of all sin. But the gratuitous remission of sin in the case of man might exert an influence prejudicial to God's government in other parts of the creation. Hence, in order to maintain His authority in the universe, He must demand some satisfaction here, so as to show that sin cannot go unpunished. This, therefore, is the meaning of the suffering and death of Christ. Though in itself not a full equivalent for the punishment due to the sins of mankind, it is accepted as such, and designed to furnish an example of God's righteousness and judgment as a pre-condition of the free forgiveness of sin.\* This theory has been held by Professor Park and others in recent times.†

But while the governmental theory has had, and perhaps still has, some able advocates, the psychologico-moral, or as it is now called, the *moral influence* theory, once advocated by Abelard and Peter Lombard, seems at present to be the most widely accepted among those who are unable to receive the penal satisfaction doctrine of the mediæval Church. This theory teaches that the sufferings of Christ were not judicial or penal; that while He suffered with sinners and in behalf of sinners, He did not suffer as a sinner. God did not lay upon Him the sin and guilt of mankind. He was at no time the object of the Father's wrath against sin, while yet Himself perfectly sinless; but He was always the object of the Father's good pleasure (Matt. iii. 17; xvii. 5). His suffering was not intended to procure God's love for sinners, but is rather the strongest possible expression and clearest exhibition of God's love. The cross, Dr. McLane tells us, is not intended to produce an effect upon God, but rather to produce an effect upon man. When we are said to have been reconciled to God by the death of Christ, this, Peter Lombard tells us, must not be supposed to mean that previously God was our enemy, and that He then only began to love us when we were reconciled to Him, but that He already loved us before the world or we

\* Comp. Shedd's *History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. II. p. 347 sq.

† *Cross in the Light of To-Day*, p. 202.

ourselves existed. The design of the cross is not to change God's mind toward us, but rather to change our minds toward God. It is intended to inspire us with feelings of sorrow and hatred of sin, and to bring us to God repentant and contrite, so that, the bar to forgiveness in ourselves having been removed, we may enjoy His pardoning grace and love. It is intended to awaken in our hearts a love to God corresponding to that which Christ exhibited toward us when He persevered in His saving work and mission in our behalf even to the death of the cross. In the language of Dr. Horace Bushnell, the most distinguished representative of this theory in modern times, "Christ suffered with us through sympathy and fellowship; the result of which was to give Him a moral power over men, spiritually quickening them, and molding them by His love and example." This is the theory substantially which Dr. McLane advocates, and for advocating which he has lost his place among the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. There are frequent glimpses of profounder truth in his work; as, for instance, when he assumes the existence of a *vital* as well as *moral* relation between Christ and believers, and makes this the ground of their justification.\* But in regard to the meaning of the suffering and death of Christ he does not, if we understand him correctly, get essentially beyond the moral influence theory now set forth, which, however, seems to us to be inconsistent with the deeper thought just noticed.

It has been common to admire the scientific strictness and logical consistency of Anselm's theory. Dr. Shedd pronounces the tract, *Cur Deus Homo*, in which it was put forth, "a remarkable composition, which exhibits a depth, breadth, and vigor of thinking, that is not surpassed by any production of the same extent in theological literature." That may be; and yet there are many earnest minds which cannot rest satisfied

\* Page 152 sq. Comp. also p. 210. Both the chapters on justification and on sanctification involve the idea of a spiritual and vital union between Christ and believers; and these chapters, we think, form the best and most interesting part of the book.

with the theory, either in the form in which it was put forward by Anselm, or in the form in which it has commonly been held since the Reformation. There is a large class of Christian thinkers, and their number is daily increasing, whose reason and conscience shrink from the acceptance of a theory that appears in such sharp contrast with the ethical conceptions and sentiments of the age in which we live. Indeed the theory labors under many logical as well as theological difficulties. Thus, for instance, in spite of the strict logical consistency which some have claimed for it, others have brought against it the charge of internal contradiction. For Anselm bases the necessity of satisfaction professedly on an internal attribute of God, namely His justice, which demands that reparation should be made for sin, because sin involves a violation of His honor. And yet Anselm also says that God's honor in itself is incorruptible and unchangeable. God cannot lose His honor. It can neither be increased nor diminished by any act of the creature. But how, then, it may be asked, can sin involve any wrong to *God*, so that His justice in the way of necessary reaction should demand an infinite satisfaction? Anselm's answer is that He must do this for the sake of His creatures. The order and harmony of the universe require it. But then it is no longer the justice of God, as an essential attribute of His being, that calls for satisfaction, but this order and harmony of the universe rather, and we are thus in the sphere of the governmental theory of Grotius.

Again, the charge has frequently been made against this theory that it involves the attributes of the Deity and the persons of the Trinity in opposition and conflict. In the first place God's justice is opposed to His love and mercy. The one demands the punishment of the sinner, the other calls for His pardon and salvation. This conflict of opposing attributes in God can only be reconciled by laying the guilt of the sinner upon the head of an innocent victim and requiring from Him full satisfaction. But this, it may be objected, is no reconciliation or balancing of attributes at all. The justice



receives its due, but the love or mercy receives nothing. In fact the love of God is thus overwhelmed and swallowed up of His justice. And yet love is a quality that lies nearer to the heart of God's being than justice. "God is love;" and the redemption of mankind is everywhere in Scripture traced back, not to the justice or the wrath of God, but to the love of God as its determining motive and ground. If it be affirmed that the mercy of God comes to its rights in view of the fact that the victim which makes satisfaction, is the Son of God whom He gives up for this purpose; then the question may be asked, what becomes of the ethical principle which forms one of the pillars of this theory, that the penalty must be paid by the party that has sinned? If it was not inconsistent with divine justice for God Himself in the person of His Son to make satisfaction for the sins of mankind, why then should it have been inconsistent with that justice to forgive those sins gratuitously? What is the difference if a creditor forgive his debtor what he owes, or if he put into his hands the money that is required to make payment? But if it be said that it is not God that makes satisfaction, but the Son of God, then it may be asked, does not this involve an undue separation of the persons of the Godhead, if not in substance, at least in mind and will? Is not the Godhead of the Father and of the Son one? Do not the attributes of the Godhead belong to all the persons alike? Granted that the justice of the Father is satisfied by the sacrifice of the Son, how then is the justice of the Son satisfied? These are questions which are not now raised for the first time, and which indicate to some extent the difficulties with which the theory is beset for thoughtful minds.

Another objection brought against the theory under consideration is, that it is inconsistent with the Scripture doctrine of the forgiveness of sin. This objection was strongly urged by the Socinians and Arminians, but it ought surely not to be supposed to have any the less weight on that account. The Bible so constantly and uniformly teaches the doctrine of the forgiveness of sin by the free grace of God, that, perhaps in



consequence of our very familiarity with this teaching, we fail to be properly impressed by it. But now, how could God in any proper sense be said to forgive sin after having received full satisfaction therefor from Christ, who suffered its penalty in our stead? Could the man be said to forgive his debtor, who exacts full payment from that debtor's security or bail? If God's forgiveness be conditioned upon the full payment of the penalty of sin, then it is no longer forgiveness. "Suppose we interject such a condition of pardon into the beautiful and touching parable of our Lord, A certain creditor had two debtors; the one owed five hundred pence and the other fifty. And when they had nothing to pay, he said, If some one will pay the full measure of your debt, I will freely forgive you both. How much personal love would be awakened by such forgiveness?" \* But the Bible never hints at such a condition. It tells us that God requires repentance as a condition of pardon; but it teaches that He grants the pardon freely, and that He demands a similar willingness to forgive each other on the part of His children. "If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you." If our neighbor has injured us, we are not to demand as a condition of forgiving him, that a similar injury should be inflicted upon that neighbor, or upon some one else in his stead; but we are to forgive him freely, and so to become like our Father in heaven.

But this same objection may be put in another form: If Christ has fully paid the penalty of the sins of mankind, then the pardon of sin is no longer a matter of grace and mercy, but a matter of debt, and God is bound in justice to pardon all alike. "No creditor can demand that a debt be paid twice; nor magistrate that a crime be twice punished; nor sovereign that a tax be twice exacted. And shall man be more just than God? Jesus has once for all paid the debt of His people to the uttermost farthing, fulfilled their duties, and made full

\* *Cross in the Light of To-day*, p. 144.

atonement for their crimes."\* Therefore let "His people" be assured that they stand in no possible danger of ever faring the worse for their sins, no matter how great or heinous these may be. That is the way in which the doctrine of the atonement is often preached for the edification and comfort of believers. And certainly the major premise of the above argument must be allowed to be correct. But will not that argument, unless we grant the old doctrines of "reprobation" and of a "limited atonement," which few would now venture to defend, inevitably lead to the doctrine of universal salvation? If Christ by His suffering and death has fully borne the penalty which was due for all the sins of all mankind, then on what ground could any sinner ever be punished for his sins? Those sins have been punished once already in the person of Christ. How then can God punish them again in the person of the sinner? This consequence was perceived long ago by the Puritan John Owen, who puts this dilemma to "our Universalists" (those who rejected the doctrine of a limited atonement): "God imposed His wrath due unto, and Christ underwent the pains of hell for, either all the sins of all men, or all the sins of some men, or some sins of all men. If the last, some sins of all men, then have all men some sins to answer for, and so no man shall be saved. . . . If the second, that is it which we affirm. . . . If the first, why then are not all freed from the punishment of all their sins?"† On the principles of the theory here in question we should not know how to escape that dilemma, and would probably have to go with Owen in favor of a "limited atonement," however impossible we might find it to be to reconcile that notion with the idea of God's love and equal justice.

It will be observed that all these objections to Anselm's theory move in the sphere of legal rather than ethical conceptions. That, however, is the fault not of the objections but of

\* Guthrie, *"Speaking to the Heart,"* quoted in *Cross in the Light of To-Day*, p. 198.

† Quoted in Hagenbach, *History of Doctrines*, vol. II. p. 357

the theory itself. That theory treats the facts of righteousness and of sin not as ethical facts, or qualities inseparable from the personality upon whose will they depend, but as legal facts, or commercial entities, that can be traded with and removed from one personality and imputed to another, as a sum of money in bank may be taken from the account of one depositor and set to the account of another. This we consider to be the fundamental vice of the theory. It appears already in Anselm's definition of sin as *debt*. The word reminds us at once of legal and commercial relations, and sets the mind to work with legal and commercial conceptions. It is true the word is Scriptural; but it is only used once in the New Testament in the sense of moral delinquency, namely in St. Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer, where it is equivalent to trespasses or transgressions, and should, therefore, not be regarded as an adequate definition of sin. No doubt, along with the idea of transgression, it also connotes the idea of *guilt*, or personal responsibility and liability to punishment, arising out of the voluntary element in the act of transgression; but as such it cannot be abrogated by any substitutionary punishment, but only by a divine act of forgiveness; and we are, therefore, encouraged to pray, "*Forgive us our debts.*"

St. John's definition of sin as *lawlessness* (*ἀνομία*) is more adequate to the nature of the subject. Sin is any act or state of man that is contrary to the divine law; and this involves guilt in so far as it is of voluntary origin. And the divine law is not an arbitrary enactment of the divine will, that might also have been otherwise than it is, but an expression of the moral nature of God corresponding to the moral nature of man who is God's image. "The law of God," says Dr. McLane, "when revealed and written, is the formal expression of what the moral nature of God demands of the moral nature of man." But since the moral nature of man is a copy of the moral nature of God, and since the works of the law are written in man's heart (Rom. ii. 15), it would be more exact to define the law of God as the expression of what the moral nature of God

and the moral nature of men demand of the human will. Man is required to be holy, not only because God is holy, but also because the ideal constitution of his own nature is holy, and because he could, therefore, not be true to himself without being holy. Now irrational beings, like plants or animals, act according to the law of their nature spontaneously and necessarily. But man is required to do so by personal volition or choice, and has power to do the contrary. The only necessity which God lays upon man is the necessity of being free. Now when he freely determines himself conformably to the divine law of his moral nature, man is morally good or holy; when he determines himself contrary to that law, he is morally evil or sins. The commission of sin, therefore, is an act of violence against himself, or against the law of his own life, as well as against God. As a consequence of this he experiences moral pain or remorse. This pain is the result of a reaction of the violated law of his own nature; just as physical pain is the consequence of a reaction of the laws of the physical constitution, when that constitution has been abused. Another immediate result of sin is the loss of moral freedom. The act of sin induces a sinful habit in the soul, a "law of sin," which the will cannot throw off at pleasure. What *caco-plastic* or *heterologous* growths\* are in the human body, that sin is in the soul, a perverted mode of action, which has become a fixed habit, and which, like a moral cancer, consumes the soul's life. This is St. Paul's "body of death" (Rom. vii. 24) from which every sinner cries more or less loudly to be delivered. For the law of the soul's true life never ceases to assert itself, and to react against the "law of sin" which is preying upon it, thus giving rise to that sense of moral pain and suffering which is inseparable from sin, and which must continue as long as sin continues. The violated law thus executes itself and inflicts its own penalty. What God has to do with this penalty is simply that He upholds and preserves the moral law which lies at the foundation of man's own nature, and which, therefore, He

\* Comp. Dr. Carpenter's *Human Physiology*, ed. of 1860, p. 355 sq.

could not relax or suspend without annihilating man himself. Thus God proves His *justice*, and in this form the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men (Rom. i. 18).

From this view of the nature of sin it will be plain at once that sin or guilt cannot be transferred or imputed from one person to another. One cannot be held guilty of anything or responsible for anything with which his own will has had nothing to do. Personal responsibility is inseparable from personal volition. No one can bear the guilt of another's sin without having himself willed it, that is, without being himself a sinner. Neither can one bear the punishment of another's sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." In consequence of the race-unity, as we shall see hereafter, one person may suffer with others, and for, or because of, others' sins; but this is not bearing the punishment of others' sins in any proper sense of the term, as is plain from the fact universally admitted, that such vicarious suffering does not relieve others of their guilt. How then, it may be asked, is salvation possible, if this view of sin be correct? We are not prepared to answer this question fully now; but we may say here that salvation is possible only on condition that the sinner comes into right relation to the law. For those who persist permanently in their opposition to the law, there is no salvation. For those who are reconciled to God, and brought into right relation to the law, by the regeneration of their nature and conversion of their will, the guilt and punishment of sin are abrogated, their sins are forgiven them, and they are saved. And Christ is the Author of this salvation, not in the sense of having made legal satisfaction for our sins by undergoing the penalty that was due for them, but in a way that is far more real, vital, spiritual and profound.

But before we go any further, it may be well, as preparing the way for our further discussion, to notice some of the arguments which are generally brought forward in defence of the theory of vicarious satisfaction. It has been common for the

defenders of the theory to set up for it the claim of exclusive Scripturalness, and to denounce all who reject it as rationalists and sceptics, who wage war upon the word of God itself. Certainly in a matter of such importance and difficulty all ought to be willing to submit their conclusions to the severest tests of Scripture. If the theory could be plainly proven to be scriptural, that would be the end of the controversy for all believers in the Bible as God's revealed word.

Now one weighty argument in favor of the theory is supposed to be contained in the very word *sacrifice* which is in the New Testament applied to Christ. We are told that He "gave Himself up for us an *offering* and a *sacrifice* to God, for an odor of a sweet smell" (Eph. v. 2), that "He has been manifested to put away sin by the *sacrifice* of Himself" (Heb. ix. 27), and that "we have been sanctified through the *offering* of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. x. 10). This language, of course, refers to the sacrificial ideas of the Old Testament. The sacrifices of the law were types of Christ. The question then is, what is the Biblical idea of a sacrifice? Did the Israelite suppose the essence of his sacrifice to consist in the pain which his victim endured in his stead, and did he regard that as forming the atoning element therein? That is what the defenders of the doctrine in question maintain, and what the opponents of it confidently deny.\* Now the idea connected with sacrificial offerings as means of atonement was probably not the same in all periods of Old Testament history. In the earliest times the offering seems to have been regarded simply as a gift or present to the Deity, which in the smoke and savor of the altar was supposed to ascend up to heaven and there to come before God as an object of satisfaction and delight. The slaying of the victim, just like the kindling of the fire, was no essential element of the offering, but was necessary only as a condition of causing the offering to go up to God's abode. This seems to be the conception underlying the account of the sacrifice of Noah (Gen. viii. 20, 21). "Jehovah smelled a

\*Cross in the *Light of To-day*, p. 71.

sweet savor," and in consequence of that resolved not again to destroy the earth, "although the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." And this seems to have been the conception which lay at the foundation of those *opus operatum* notions of sacrifice against which the prophets so often contend (Hos. vi. 6, Amos v. 21-27, Isa. i. 11, Mic. vi. 6-9, Jer. vi. 20, vii. 21), and in consequence of which the very word for *atonement* could in the language of common life be used in the signification of *bribe* (1 Sam. xii. 3, Amos v. 12), and that for *sacrifice* (*mincha*) in the signification of a *present* given to curry favor with a king (1 Sam. x. 27, 1 Kings iv. 21). It was a further development of the idea of sacrifice in the line of spiritual refinement when the offering was regarded as an expression of good will, and as a symbol of self-consecration and submission to God, and when its acceptability and atoning quality were thus made dependent upon the good disposition of the offerer. Here the offering was no longer supposed to be something pleasing to God in itself, apart from the moral disposition of him who brought it, as it ought to have been if the pain endured by the victim had been the atoning element. It was now understood that to obey is better than sacrifice (1 Sam. xv. 22), nay, that obedience is the very essence of sacrifice; and that the sacrifice of the wicked is abomination (Prov. xxi. 27). To this symbolical element in the idea of sacrifice the Levitical law finally adds a mystical and typical element, when it represents the life or soul of the victim offered as an atonement or *covering* (*kopher*) for the soul of the offerer. This view is dogmatically expressed in connection with the prohibition of blood, Lev. xvii. 11, "For the life (*nephesh*, *soul*) of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes atonement *by means of the soul*."

It is, then, not the pain which the animal suffers, nor the material element of the blood, nor the act of shedding the blood, but the life or soul which is in the blood, that constitutes atonement for the soul, covering (*kapper*) its sins in the sight of

God. The full import of this, in its typical relation, we shall see hereafter. At present we are simply concerned to show that the idea of a *pæna vicaria* was never connected with the notion of a sacrifice, that is, that it was never supposed that what the offerer deserved as a sinner was executed upon the animal when it was slain, and that thus the death of the sacrifice satisfied the punitive justice of God. This is the view of modern Rabbinical Judaism,\* but that it was not the view of canonical Judaism is plain from the fact that the act of making atonement is never connected with the slaying of the victim, but always with the subsequent use of the blood. In the case of the sin-offering and trespass-offering the act of slaying the victim and the act of making atonement are separated and performed by different persons. The offerer *slays* the victim himself, and then the priest *makes atonement* for him by the subsequent manipulation of the blood. See Lev. v. verse 24 compared with 26, and verse 29 compared with 31. "Nowhere in the laws concerning sacrifice," says Oehler, "can we find a foundation for the dogma, that it is only because the victim *accomplishes* something for the offerer, by vicariously suffering the penalty of death, that its life, offered in the blood, can serve as an atonement for him."† The mere fact, then, that the term sacrifice is applied to Christ does not prove that His suffering and death are to be regarded in the light of a vicarious punishment for the sins of the world.

But Christ is also said to have borne our sins, and to have suffered and died for sins and in behalf of sinners. He is the "Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world" (John i. 29). He was "once offered to bear the sins of many" (Heb. ix

\*The modern Jews, in preparation for the day of atonement, kill a cock, symbolizing upon it the four forms of capital punishment, namely, strangling, beheading, stoning and burning, with the prayer, "May this cock be an exchange for me! May it be in my stead! May it be a propitiation for me! Let this cock go to death, but may I go to a good life with all Israel! Amen." There is the idea of substitutionary punishment very plainly, but that is not in the Bible. See Oehler's *Theology of the Old Testament* Vol. II. p. 57.

† *Theol. of Old Test.* Vol. II. p. 55.



28), and He "bare our sins in His body upon the tree" (1 Pet. ii. 24). He "died for our sins according to the Scriptures" (1 Cor. xv. 3), and He "suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God" (1 Pet. iii. 18). "While we were yet weak, in due season, Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. v. 6). Here it is to be observed, first, that what Christ is said to have borne is not the wrath of God, not the guilt or punishment of human sin, but sin; and secondly, that in those passages in which this bearing of sin or suffering for sin is defined with reference to its design, this is done in terms which imply that that design is not a legal or judicial, but a moral one. He bare our sins in His body upon the tree, not that in our stead He might satisfy any legal claims, but that "we having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness." He suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, not that He might reconcile God to us by appeasing His judicial wrath, but that "He might bring us to God." "While we were enemies, *we* were reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. v. 10). God appointed us to obtain "salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him" (1 Thess. v. 10).

Now it is a well known fact that the innocent may bear the sins of the guilty, and that the righteous may suffer for the unrighteous. In consequence of the solidarity of the human race there is a vast amount of this sort of vicarious suffering. This is what forms the tragic element in human history. Thus the wife and children of an inebriate husband and father suffer for his sins, not in the sense of having the guilt of his sins laid upon them, for that would be impossible, but in the sense of bearing the natural misery which his sins entail upon them in consequence of their physical connection with him. Thus the evil conduct of a wicked son may bring down a father's and a mother's gray hairs in sorrow to the grave, (Gen. xlii. 28). Many a time this vicarious suffering may result in the moral advantage of those for whom, and in consequence of whose

sins it is endured. The contemplation of the suffering of an innocent child may soften the heart of a wicked father, and cause him to turn with loathing from his sins. The dying martyr suffers, bears the sins (but surely not the guilt) of those who contribute to his death; but to some of his persecutors that martyrdom may be the beginning of a new moral life. The death of Stephen leads to the conversion of Saul. Thus the blood of the martyrs becomes the seed of the Church. St. Paul reminds the Ephesians that he is "a prisoner *for them*," that is, in their behalf, and that "his tribulations for them are their glory," (Eph. iii. 1-13), meaning that his fidelity to his calling and mission as an Apostle to the Gentiles has brought him into bonds, and that his sufferings in this way turn to their spiritual advantage and salvation. On this, Braune the Commentator, remarks: "The idea of substitution is more *ethical* than *doctrinal* (we would say *legal*), and finds a sphere in the whole of human life, in its narrowest and widest circles. The Apostle suffers for his church; his suffering is for her advantage. So the child lives at the expense of its parents. . . . Benefactors suffer for their wards, and suffering for them remove their pain and need. So the shepherds of the people. The suffering of human life is in its widest range vicarious."\* And this vicarious suffering which pervades all circles of human life, is but the shadow of that which has taken place at the center.

Thus then the suffering of Christ is truly vicarious, though not for that reason judicial or penal. In consequence of His incarnation He became organically connected with a sinful race, and bore the general consequences of sin so far as these are comprehended in misery apart from guilt. He bore the sins of the world upon His heart in the way of sympathy or compassion (a compassionate high-priest, Heb. v. 2), and in the way of holy grief and sorrow; as a mother, for example, may bear upon her heart the sins of an erring son, or as prophets and apostles may bear the sins of their people (Jer.

\* Lange's *Bible-Work*, Eph. p. 118.

ix. 1. Rom. ix. 2).<sup>\*</sup> And He bore the sins of the world, finally, in the sense of being the object upon which those sins concentrated themselves in the way of hostile rage and violence. In this way, then, "He was wounded *of* † our transgressions, He was bruised *of* our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed," (Isa. liii. 5). The advocates of the vicarious punishment doctrine are wont to appeal to the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, as if their whole theory were written there in unmistakable characters. And yet that chapter, when closely examined, teaches nothing more than the general fact that the sins of His people would be the cause of suffering to the Messiah, and that this suffering would turn to the advantage and salvation of His people. "Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows," says the prophet. St. Matthew sees a fulfilment of this language in the fact that He cast out evil spirits and healed all that were sick, (Math. viii. 17). "He took our infirmities, and bare our diseases," not in the sense that these were imputed to Him, or actually laid upon Him, so that He Himself suffered them otherwise than in the way of sympathy, but He took them in the sense that He removed them from those who were afflicted and healed them. Should not this explanation of the Evangelist suggest a similar explanation of "His taking upon Himself and bearing our sins?" ‡ But the prophet has in his eye the image of a suffering Messiah, and he continues: "We esteemed Him stricken, smitten of God and afflicted." That, however, is a mistake. His suffering comes not from God, but from the wickedness of men. "He was wounded *of* our transgressions, he was bruised *of* our iniquities." "The sufferings of Christ came from earth, not

<sup>\*</sup> See Cross in the "Light of To-day," p. 35 sq.

† The Hebrew preposition here is *min*, which according to Gesenius signifies *source, origin, author, agent, instrument, efficient or remote cause*. The LXX has *διὰ, through*. *Of*, we think expresses the sense of the original most exactly.

‡ "He bare (*nāsâ*) the sins of many," (ver. 11). But *nāsâ* signifies *forgiveness* in Ps. lxxxv. 2; Ps. xcix. 8, and elsewhere.

from heaven, from the sins of men, not from the wrath of God. The blow, the scourge, the thorn, the nail were made to bruise and cut and pierce the body of Christ by the hatred and malice and cruelty of men who rejected and persecuted and crucified Him."\* There is only one way of evading the force of this reasoning, and that is to say that, in the crucifixion of Christ, God made use of men as unconscious instruments for the execution of His will. But that would presuppose a fatalistic view of the world, which would rob men of their liberty and make God the real author of sin. The cross of Christ was, indeed, an object of divine *foreordination* (Acts ii. 23 and iv. 8); but that foreordination was not an unconditional decree, and extended not to the motives and volitions of those who crucified Christ, but only to the matter of the action and to its result as a condemnation and self-annihilation of sin. The men who enacted the tragedy of the cross were free, and moved only by their own hatred and malice; but, as happens in so many a tragic act of history, that the suffering which the malice of the wicked brings upon the more innocent, becomes the occasion of reconciliation and peace to the warring factions of society, so the great tragedy of the cross, taking place in the centre of the world's historical life casts its power and influence over the hearts of all men, slaying their enmity and reconciling them all in one body to God (Eph. ii. 15-16). Hence the Prophet declares once more, "The chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed." In all this there is nothing of the idea of imputed guilt or of substitutionary punishment. We may feel, as probably most persons will feel, that there are ideas here which go beyond the theory of moral influence, but they certainly give no countenance to the doctrine of vicarious legal satisfaction.

Nor does this doctrine derive any support from the fact that Christ is said to be the *propitiation* (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins (1 John ii. 2, iv. 6). The propitiation does not consist so much in what Christ has done or suffered, as in what He is.

\* *Cross in the "Light of To day,"* p. 49.

"He is the propitiation." His doing and suffering are important only as factors of the process by which He became such. Now *ἱλασμός* is formed from the root of *ἰλάσσεσθαι*, and denotes the product of the action expressed by the verb. But *ἰλάσσεσθαι* or *ἐξιλάσσεσθαι* is the word by means of which the Septuagint most frequently translates the Hebrew *kipper*, to make atonement. The *ἱλασμός* then is the *kopher* or atonement that covers a man's sins in the sight of God; and that, as we have already seen, was in the Old Testament, from which St. John's language is derived, supposed to be the living soul of the sacrificial victim. And so Christ Himself, not His death, is the propitiation or atonement for our sins. The same remark essentially applies to the fact that Christ is said to have given Himself a ransom (*λύτρον, ἀντὶ λύτρου*) for sinners (Matt. xx. 28, 1 Tim. ii. 6). He gave *Himself*, His *life*, His *soul*. That which constitutes the ransom is not the act or manner of giving, but the gift that was given. Besides, it is never said to whom the ransom was paid. It was certainly not paid to the devil. Nor could it have been paid to God, for, as Gregory of Nazianzum remarks, man was never in captivity to God so as to need redemption from this quarter. Where the verb *λυτροῦσθαι* is used with the addition of the object from which the sinner is redeemed or freed, that object is not God, but sin. Christ "gave Himself for us, that He might redeem us from *all iniquity*" (Tit. ii. 14). Compare also 1 Pet. i. 18. Redemption, then, consists not in deliverance from the claims of divine law and justice by the substituted suffering of a Mediator, but in deliverance from the "law of sin" by the *life* of that Mediator.

But there are two passages of Scripture which at first sight seem to lend more countenance to the doctrine of substitutionary punishment: the first is 2 Cor. v. 21, "Him who knew no sin he made to be sin in our behalf, that we might become the righteousness of God in Him;" the second, Gal. iii. 13, "Christ redeemed (*ἐξηγόρασεν*) us from the curse of the law, having been made a curse for us; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." But even in regard to these passages

it is to be observed, as Dr. McLane remarks, that it is not said that Christ was made to be sin or a curse in our stead, but in our behalf, the preposition *ὑπέρ* denoting not *substitution*, but *advantage*. The first passage has been explained by reference to the sin-offering. *Chattâth* in Hebrew signifies not only sin, but also sin-offering; and in this sense it has been supposed that *ἀμαρτία* is used here. In that case the passage comes under the head of sacrifice, and has already been sufficiently attended to. But Dr. McLane suggests the following explanation, which seems to be quite as good as any that can be given: "Paul wishes to show how completely Christ identified Himself with us that we might be identified with Him. Now, sin is the source and the principle of suffering and sorrow, of pain and death, and may be used to designate itself and all the evils which flow from it; and Christ who identified Himself with us in nature and suffering, in sorrow and death, may be said to have been made sin for us." \* To the meaning of the second passage St. Paul himself furnishes us the key by his reference to the declaration of the law, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." The expression "made a curse" then simply refers to the mode of his death, the accursed death of the cross among malefactors, whereby the Christian is freed both from the observance and from the curse of that law which the Jew still feared.

We have no hesitation, then, in affirming with a host of Christian thinkers, from Abelard down to Bushnell and McLane, that the theory which regards the death of Christ as a legal satisfaction for human sins, is philosophically and Scripturally untenable. But are we now shut up to the moral influence theory as the only alternative, and are we to regard this as a satisfactory solution of the question concerning the relation of the death of Christ to human redemption? This we do not believe. The cross of Christ was not merely an impressive expedient in the process of redemption, but a necessity for Christ Himself. "Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into His glory?" (Luke xxiv. 26). But

\* Cross in the "*Light of To-day*," p. 63.

this theory seems to make of it all a mere stage performance designed for effect. In this view the cross becomes simply a spectacle intended to make an impression upon the human mind, and to move men to repentance and sorrow for sin, so that they may become willing and able to accept forgiveness. That the crucifixion of Christ exercises such an influence over the hearts of men is, of course, not to be denied. The Centurion who stood by the cross of Jesus and watched His suffering exclaimed, "Of a truth, this was the Son of God;" and the story of the cross has in all ages melted men to penitence and tears. But was this the sole purpose for which in the counsel of God the cross was lifted up? We cannot think so; for would not in that case the discovery of the fact have been at once the dissolution of the charm? Is it not a law of the human mind that a scene intended simply for effect fails of its purpose so soon as that purpose becomes known? Would not the cross lose its power if it should ever be discovered to have been an expedient only of this kind? As thus viewed the death of Christ was not a necessity in order to human salvation; for it is certainly conceivable that other means also might have been employed to make men penitent, and to convince them of God's love and mercy. And why might not a docetic Christ have served the purpose quite as well as the real Christ? If the cross was simply a spectacle designed to impress the minds of men, to arouse their moral sensibilities, and thus to purify and reform them, then why should not the docetic show of a cross have been quite as effectual a means of salvation as the real cross and the real death of Christ? When we are told that we are justified by the blood of Christ (Rom. v. 9), and that His blood cleanses us from all sin (1 John i. 7), we understand this to mean a great deal more than that the contemplation of the death of Christ leads men to repent and to love God, and that by this means their sins are conquered and their hearts purified. Nor do we believe, as we have already intimated, that this theory satisfies those passages of Scripture in which the death of Christ is represented as a sacrifice, or those in



which Christ is spoken of as a propitiation for sin and a ransom for sinners. These passages, we hold, point to a deeper view of the relation of Christ's person and work to human salvation than the doctrine now under consideration allows.

Christ is the Saviour of sinners not simply in that He came to publish salvation, or to proclaim God's intention to forgive sin on condition of repentance and reformation, and to seal this message by His death; but He is the Saviour of sinners in that the constitution of His person is a fountain of life and grace, of healing and saving power for fallen men. He is "the last Adam," "a life-giving spirit," the "man of heaven," in whom the natural and earthy race of the first Adam is destined to become spiritual and heavenly (1 Cor. xv.) and in whom all things in heaven and upon the earth are to be summed up (Eph. i. 10). The original, ideal constitution of humanity looked to Christ as its crowning head, in whom the entire body was to be glorified by being united with the Divinity and thus made to partake of the Divine nature. The old Rabbis were, therefore, right in saying that the mystery of Adam is the mystery of the Messiah. It was not the occurrence of sin first that made necessary the incarnation of God; on the contrary, the necessity of this existed in the nature of God itself, in the essence of His life as love, in His desire and purpose to communicate Himself to, and glorify Himself in an organized kingdom of finite personalities. Thus the idea of Christ is the absolute center of the eternal divine world-plan. And when sin came into the creation as a disturbing, disordering element, this did not necessitate a change of plan on the part of God. His eternal plan of the world, born of His eternal love, kept on unfolding itself through history, and in the fulness of time Christ came, in whom the creation was destined to attain to its consummation and glorification in God. But the process of this consummation and glorification was greatly modified by the fact of sin. It became a process of restoration, of purification, of salvation as well as of consummation and of glorification. Indeed the glorification became possible only in and through



the process of salvation. And Christ must, therefore, be a Saviour; He must break the chains of sin, He must purify and quicken human nature and free it from the disorder of sin, before He can conduct it to the glory for which it is destined.

This saving process began at the moment of the incarnation, for which all previous stages of the world's life had been a preparation. The humanity into which the Son of God came was sinful, the nature which He assumed was corrupt. But in assuming it He purified and sanctified it. All Protestant thinkers are agreed in regarding the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary as a baseless fiction. But if Mary was a sinner, and Christ sinless, then the Eternal Word, in assuming human nature of her and becoming man, must have eliminated the depravity and corruption of sin, and thus in His own person first of all purified and sanctified human nature. And human nature purified and sanctified in Christ is the source of purity, of holiness, of salvation for others; just as human nature fallen and depraved in Adam is the source of corruption and sin for his posterity. This we conceive to be the meaning of St. Paul's profound discussion in Rom. v. But the process of sanctification in virtue of which the humanity of Christ became a fountain of salvation to the world, was throughout an ethical process. "For their sakes *I sanctify myself*" (John xvii. 19). It consisted in free, voluntary obedience to the eternal divine law (Rom. v. 19). And this ethical process was further, in consequence of the fact that it was accomplished in a fallen world and in the midst of a sinful race, an ethical conflict with evil, which came to a victorious end for Christ in the death of the cross. This we believe to be the true meaning of the cross of Christ. It was the last struggle with evil, the last trial of His holy will, the last temptation of His soul, that was necessary to complete the moral process of His life, and make Him perfect as the author of salvation. "It became Him, for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons to glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through suffering." "Though He was a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered; and

having been made perfect He became unto all that obey Him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. ii. 10, v. 8-9).

We shall endeavor to illustrate this view by a brief glance at the historical life of Jesus. That life was from beginning to end an ethical process, involving the factors of duty, of freedom and of self-determination, just as any other moral life does. Though He was the Son of God, He had taken upon Him the nature of man and existed now in human form. He had the body, soul and spirit of man. He lived a genuine human life. But in order to the reality of human life it is necessary that there should be a process of moral as well as of intellectual and physical development. And all these forms of development are predicated of Jesus. Twice is the fact of moral and spiritual growth asserted of Him in the second chapter of St. Luke's Gospel. "The child grew and waxed strong, becoming full of wisdom: and the grace of God was upon Him." "Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men." These passages distinctly affirm of Jesus a process of moral and spiritual development. But such a process implies freedom of choice between good and evil, a sense of moral obligation or duty, and the power of volition or self-determination, unconstrained by any thing in the nature of the personality or in its environment. This formal freedom, which is absolute at the beginning of the process, can only be transformed into real or essential freedom by a series of good volitions or choices, as a result of which at last a fixed character is formed, and when this is reached evil becomes impossible; but until it is reached, evil volitions, or evil choices, though they become more and more improbable, are not impossible. Now when a process of moral development is ascribed to Jesus, as, for instance, when it is said that He *learned obedience*, all this must be understood as being implied. To ascribe to Jesus absolute impeccability, or a *non posse peccare*, from the start, is to make His moral life unreal and turn His temptations into sham. This would give us a Gnostic Christ instead of the real.

Now the main condition of the moral development of Jesus,

the object of His self-determination, and the test of His obedience must have been *suffering*. The form of a man's temptations is determined by his subjective endowments and by his objective position and calling. For the first Adam in Paradise the object of temptation was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, the form of the trial corresponding to the degree of culture which man had reached at the moment. But for Jesus no object of that sort could have had any force of temptation. The outward material world, offering itself as an object of gratification to the bodily senses, could have exercised no undue influence over His holy soul. So neither could the duties devolving upon Him as a member of human society ever become a matter of temptation or an occasion of sin to Him. The duty, for instance, of loving and obeying His parents, or the duty of respecting the rights of property, could never involve any serious trial for Him. But suffering, pain, at the same time that He possessed the power of avoiding it, would be a trial to Him of the most real and fearful sort; and in this way, therefore, His soul must be tempted and His obedience made perfect. The world into which He had come was sinful. It was estranged from God, and its entire life was pervaded by the virus of moral evil. Men were enemies of God, loving sin, and hating the light because their deeds were evil. Now in such a world no holy life would be possible without suffering. The development of such a life on the part of Jesus would necessarily bring Him into conflict with the world, arouse its animosity, and expose Him to persecution, suffering and death. The prophecy of Plato is well known, that if a perfectly righteous man should ever appear in the world, he would be scourged, tortured, fettered, deprived of his eyes, and, after having endured all possible sufferings, nailed to a post, in order that he might try his justice in not allowing himself to be shaken by ill report or any thing that springs therefrom, but in remaining constant until death. Plato knew enough of the world, which would not even allow Socrates to live, to be quite sure that it would not tolerate a perfectly righteous man.

Now, the question for Jesus was, whether He would be true to the ideal of a holy Messiah and brave the opposition and suffering which the world threatened Him, or whether He would go over to the world and make His peace with it; and that was the temptation. The question must have met Him more than once during His early life in the family of Joseph and among His companions at Nazareth. "The contradiction of sinners" which He there endured must not only often have made His holy heart bleed, but must also have had the force of temptation for His immaculate soul. And this conflict with the world and the temptation which it involved, increased in force and violence as His life advanced. When He came to enter upon His public career as the Messiah of Israel, He was met by the false Messianic conceptions and ideals of His people, holding out to Him the prospect of worldly success and comfort if He would yield to them, but of rejection, persecution and suffering if He would refuse to do so. This was the substance of the temptation in the wilderness. The devil presented to Him the alternative between a political Messiahship in the sense of a perverse worldly Judaism, and immediate recognition and popularity on the one hand, and of a holy Messiahship in the sense of the ancient Prophets, and persecution and suffering on the other hand. Jesus chose the latter alternative, and the result was an immediate break between Him and the body of the Jewish people, especially as represented by its official leaders; and so "He came unto His own, and His own received Him not." In the wilderness He triumphed over the temptation, and the devil left Him; but only for a season. The temptation was renewed on different occasions afterwards, notably through the person of Peter, when he undertook to dissuade Him from submitting to the suffering which He had foretold (Matt. xvi. 23); and again in Gethsemane, when He sweated as it were drops of blood and cried, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." But it was not possible, without abandoning the principles and the mission of His life; and, therefore, He resolved to drink it. The cross was not a

matter of physical necessity for Him ; but in the condition of the world it was a moral necessity which He could not escape without loss of holiness. Though He might have called down twelve legions of angels to save Him out of the hands of sinners, yet He could not do so without abandoning the object of His mission (to exercise His Messianic office, and to establish His kingdom in a moral way), and He resolved, therefore, to be true to that, though it should cost Him His life. The cross, therefore, was the consequence of His fidelity to the will of His Father, and the extreme trial through which His obedience was made perfect.

As being the proof and consequence of His obedience to the Father's will, the death of Christ is a true sacrifice to God ; and as being occasioned by the sinfulness of the world, it is a sacrifice for sin. What else than this could be the meaning of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, when he applies to Christ the language of the xl. Psalm, in which the doing of the will of God is recognized as the very essence of acceptable sacrifice ? "Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared for me ; in whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hadst no pleasure : then said I, Lo, I come (in the roll of the book it is written of me) to do Thy will, O God. Saying above, Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou wouldst not, neither hadst pleasure therein (the which are offered according to the law), then hath he said, Lo I come to do Thy will. He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second. In which will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all" (Heb. x.). The essence of the sacrifice of Christ consisted in His doing the will of God ; and because of the wickedness of the world He could do this perfectly only at the expense of His life. When in doing the will of God and for doing the will of God He laid down His life, then His obedience was complete, the process of His sanctification was finished, and He was made perfect as the author of our salvation. And in this will which

has been thus accomplished by Christ, or in Christ, who has received the Divine will into Himself as the law of holiness triumphing in His death (the offering of His body) over all undivine, worldly or unholy influences—in Christ we also have been received once for all into the condition of saints, whose sins are covered by His perfect righteousness, and who are quickened and sanctified by His grace and Spirit.

We saw before that, according to the teaching of the Old Testament, the atoning quality of a sacrifice consisted in the pure soul of the victim offered coming between God and the sinner as a covering for his sin. And so now Christ, made perfect by His doing the will of God even unto death, and having passed into the heavenly sanctuary as the eternal high-priest of the new covenant, comes between us and God, covering our sins with His perfect righteousness and holiness. Thus He is our *propitiation*, in whom we become objects of the Divine good pleasure; and our *ransom*, through which we are redeemed from the law of sin and death. We are justified by His blood, not in the sense that the material element of His blood, or the act of shedding His blood in death, is the procuring cause of our righteousness; but we are justified by His blood in the sense that His soul or life, which, according to Biblical views, is in the blood, covers our sins in the sight of God and causes us to be regarded as righteous, because we are spiritually and vitally conjoined with Him. The merit or righteousness of Christ is not a legal or commercial thing, that may be in an outward way assigned from one person to another, but a quality inseparable from His person; and it can, therefore, only benefit those who are vitally and morally united with Him. "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made them free from the law of sin and death." Undoubtedly, justification is a declarative judgment of God, by which the sinner is acquitted, or by which his sins are forgiven and he is pronounced just; but such a judgment of God is possible only on the ground of a vital spiritual union with Christ, in virtue o

which the sinner carries within himself already the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" as a principle and power of sanctification, by which he is destined ultimately to become like Christ in character. 'This is one of the central facts of Christianity," says Dr. McLane, "which should be sharply defined and boldly stated. Men are not justified by means of the imputation of the righteousness of another whose keeping the law takes the place of their keeping the law, but men are justified by means of a spiritual and vital union with Christ, by which they have put within them a principle of holy living which will ultimately enable them to keep the law, even as Christ Himself has kept the law, and they are meanwhile accepted in Him as their head, and treated as though they were righteous as He is righteous."\* This is clearly stated and needs no comment; and it is nothing more than St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith; for, with St. Paul, faith in its highest Christian form means nothing else than a union of life with Christ (comp. Gal. ii. 20, and Eph. iii. 17), so that the believer in whom Christ dwells may be said to have been crucified with Christ and to live unto God.†

We believe that the view of the atonement here presented in imperfect outlines only has the advantage of involving all the elements of truth contained in other theories. It is commonly said that all the theories on this subject which the history of theology has produced, contain elements of truth, and that this is what gives them their power of life and their right to live. A true theory then must present all the elements of truth contained in other theories, each in its proper position and relation to all the rest. How shall such a theory be formed? Surely not by putting all existing theories side by side, and then striking a balance. Eclecticism like that can never result in a consistent whole or system of truth. Such a system can only be produced by the development of a single principle which in-

\* *Cross in the Light of To-Day*, p. 152.

† On this point compare Canon Farrar's *Life and Work of St. Paul*, Funk & Wagnall's ed., p. 358. Also, *The Early Days of Christianity* by the same author, p. 176.



volves germinally all the elements that the system shall contain.

Now the above view allows its right to the idea of some of the earliest Fathers that the incarnation itself was a saving act of God.\* The union of divinity and humanity in the person of Christ is certainly the principle of redemption for humanity, the medium through which the divine life pours itself into the bosom of humanity in order to its salvation and glorification. The incarnation is not simply in order to the expiatory death of Christ, but it is in order to the person of Christ, who is the author not only of salvation, but also of glorification for the world. Hence the joyful tone of the festival of Christ's nativity. Christmas is not simply a prelude of Good Friday, but has a significance of its own, which Christian feeling has always recognized, though theology may sometimes have ignored it.

Again, this view recognizes the legitimacy of that conception of the Fathers which regarded the work of redemption as carried on through all the stages and periods of Christ's life, so that His death is only the last and crowning act in the redemptive process, so far as this was a conflict with evil, preparing the way for the absolute consummation of the process through His resurrection from the dead, and His glorification at the right hand of God. This conception appears in the often quoted passage of Irenæus, in which he speaks of Christ as having passed through every stage of human life in order that He might sanctify and save all men of every age.† It is in-

\* This idea is expressed by Irenæus: "When He became incarnate, and was made man, He summed up in Himself the long line of human beings, and furnished us, in a brief, comprehensive manner, with salvation." *Against Heresies*, III., 18: 1, Clark's Ante-Nicene Library. And also by Origen: "From Him there began the union of the divine with the human nature, in order that the human, by communion with the divine, might rise to be divine, not in Jesus alone, but in all those who not only believe, but enter upon the life which Jesus taught." *Against Celsus*, III., xxviii., Clark's Ante-Nicene Library. Compare Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, Vol. I., p. 179 sq.

† *Against Heresies*, II., xxii., 4. Compare also V., xxiii., 2: "By summing up the whole human race from beginning to end, He has also summed up (re-capitulated) its death."



volved also in the ancient Litany. If the life of Christ was an ethical process, and an ethical conflict with evil, terminating triumphantly in His death, then every event and every stage of that process must have had a significance for the whole, and the last event was only the fitting conclusion of the entire process. And then, not only His death, but every event and act of His life—His circumcision, His baptism, fasting and temptation, His death and burial, His resurrection and ascension—must have contributed something to our salvation, just as we have it implied in the Litany.

This view also recognizes the element of truth in the Patristic theory which regarded the suffering of Christ as having a relation to the devil. That theory was false in so far as it regarded the death of Christ as a price paid to the devil for releasing the souls of men, but it contained this element of truth, which is also recognized largely in Scripture, that the death of Christ, as it is the last stage in a moral conflict with evil, is a victory over the powers of darkness, a bruising of the head of the serpent, and thus a fulfillment of the promise of the *prot-evangelium*. "Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the devil." Having in His cross spoiled principalities and powers, He made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it (Col. ii., 15). The cross of Christ is indeed a triumph over all the powers of evil, both human and angelic, inasmuch as it is the last and crowning stage in the development of a moral life, which resisted them at every step, and beat back their most violent as well as seductive assaults.

We believe that this view also recognizes and embodies all the elements of truth in Anselm's theory of vicarious satisfaction. It recognizes fully the vicariousness of Christ's suffering. He suffered in behalf of sinners and on account of their sins. Had there been no sin in the world, the God-man would not have been subject to the necessity of suffering. He suffered, therefore, not, indeed, in the stead of sinners, not as a sinner, bearing in His conscience the guilt of sin as if He himself had been the transgressor, but He suffered for sinners, bearing the

burden and misery of men's sins upon His heart, and enduring the natural consequences of the world's sinfulness in His body. So this view also recognizes the necessity of a satisfaction of divine justice. Sinners can only be saved on condition that the divine law and justice be satisfied. But this condition cannot be fulfilled by the punishment of the innocent instead of the guilty, but only by the sinner's coming into right moral relation to the law, and so becoming himself just and holy. Indeed no suffering of punishment by any one can ever satisfy the claims of the moral law; the only way in which that can be satisfied is by rendering the obedience which it demands. That was the way in which Christ satisfied the law. When the sinner suffers the penalty of His sins he is not satisfying the law, and just for that reason the punishment of an unsaved sinner can never end. If the law could be satisfied by the suffering of punishment, then the sinner would have the prospect of some time reaching the end of his punishment. That, however, as all will agree, is impossible. But if the sinner repent, and turn from his evil way, and begin to do right and to obey the law, then the law is satisfied, and the sinner freed from the necessity of punishment. There is no violation of justice in this. A man does not become unjust by forgiving his neighbor's trespass. The father of the prodigal was not unjust because, when his erring son came back repentant and determined to be a better and more obedient son in future, he forgave him and received him once more into his paternal favor. And so God does not violate any claims of justice when He freely forgives the penitent sinner, whose heart has been renewed in virtue of his union with Christ, and in whom the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has already begun to work as a principle which promises to make him to be of like character with Christ. It has often been said that the conscience of the sinner itself demands an expiation, or a payment of the penalty of sin, in order to its own peace. Now we confess that we have never been able to understand this. If that were so, then it would seem that the wicked, who are

themselves suffering the penalty of their sins in the place of torment, should have good consciences. Or would personal punishment not be as efficacious as substitutionary punishment? Would the conscience of a murderer be satisfied by the execution of an innocent man in his stead? No; we believe that what the conscience of the sinner cries out for, is not the punishment of a substitute in his stead, but personal righteousness and holiness. And that is what, in the view here presented, the sinner finds and obtains in Christ. "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin" (1 John i. 7). And if the blood of Old Testament sacrifices had power "to sanctify unto the cleanness of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without blemish unto God, cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God" (Heb. ix. 14). In these passages the blood, as we understand it, is not a symbol of pain, of death, of punishment endured, but a symbol of life. The life is in the blood; and the blood maketh atonement by means of the life or soul that is in it. These passages, then, simply tell us that in virtue of our vital and spiritual union with the unblemished Christ, who was made perfect through suffering, our moral and spiritual nature also is quickened and renewed, so that we also may serve the living God, and thus fulfill the law of righteousness.

And, finally, this view recognizes all the elements of truth contained in the moral influence theory. The cross certainly is an exhibition of love and devotion on the part of Christ that is well suited to awaken love and devotion in the heart of the sinner. Christ suffered for our sake. He allowed Himself to be crucified at the hands of sinful men, because He loved them and would not give them up to perish in their sins. "And greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." Such love certainly ought to awaken love in the hearts of those who are thus loved. And, then, in this view also the life and suffering of Christ are invested with their full meaning and force as an example and pattern to be-

lievers. If the temptation of Christ had been an unreal sham, if His holiness had been without choice, if His suffering had been a matter of physical necessity for Him, if He suffered because He had imputed to Him all the guilt of all the world's sins, then He could in no respect be an example and pattern to His followers. But if He was really tempted as we are, and if He really learned obedience by the things which He suffered, then His steadfast and patient endurance of suffering may serve as a copy for our imitation. And it is often appealed to for this purpose in the New Testament. Take only the following passages in conclusion: "What glory is it, if, when ye sin, and are buffeted for it, ye take it patiently? but if, when ye do well and suffer for it, ye shall take it patiently, this is acceptable with God. For even hereunto were ye called: because Christ also suffered for you, leaving you an example, that ye should follow His steps" (1 Pet. ii. 20, 21). "Let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith, who for the joy that was set before Him endured the cross, despising the shame, and hath set down at the right hand of the throne of God" (Heb. xii. 2).

### III.

#### THE PRISON-WORK OF HUGO GROTIUS.

BY REV. M. G. HANSEN, A. M.

It is a consequence of the intestine commotions and of the invasions by foreign enemies from which the Netherlands suffered six centuries ago, that many of the fairest castles were destroyed. One of these, situated between the ancient cities of Delft and The Hague, was the seat of the noble house of Krajenburg. About the year 1300 this honorable family, upon which the name of De Groot had been conferred as a reward for some distinguished service done to the government, with a view to greater security abandoned the castle and settled in Delft. The magistrates of the city gave this family a warm welcome, and in the course of time elevated many of its members to some of the highest official positions within their gift. In 1530, Ermgaerd, daughter of Diederik de Groot who died without male issue, married the noble Cornelius Cornetz. A condition to the marriage was that the children who should be born to them were to retain the name of De Groot. A fruit of this union was a son, who became the grandfather of the celebrated Hugo, born at Delft, on Easter Sunday, April 10, 1583.

Already in his seventh year the boy, who in early life gave evidence of precocity, was placed by his father under the tuition of the best teachers. His progress was very rapid. In his ninth year he composed poems of merit. In his twelfth year he entered the University of Leyden, where, within three years he completed his studies in philosophy, astronomy, geometry, theology and jurisprudence. About this time the famous John of Olden-Barnevelt went as ambassador from the States-Gen-

eral of the Netherlands to the court of Henry the Great of France. This statesman took young De Groot with him and introduced him to the stirring political life of the period. The French King was so impressed with his precocious learning and address, that he presented him with a gold chain and a copy of his royal likeness.

Returning to his native land De Groot began the practice of law. Before he was seventeen years old he successfully conducted a case through the courts. In his twenty-fourth year the States of Holland and Zealand appointed him to the office of Fiscal Advocate. In 1613, Elias Van Olden-Barnevelt, brother of John, died, and the position of Pensionary of Rotterdam thus having become vacant, De Groot was elected to fill it. He signified his willingness to accept it on the condition that he should be shielded by an express resolution of the magistrates of Rotterdam against his removal at any time contrary to his will. The condition was duly honored and De Groot was installed. His incumbency, however, was only of short duration. The storm of a politico-religious character which had long been brewing, burst over him with great violence. Deposition from office, imprisonment and exile awaited him.

A controversy which was conducted at first around the doctrine of predestination and the relation between the church and the State, was transferred from the domains of theology and church-government to that of politics. The clergy and the laity, the States-General and the common people, Prince Maurice and Olden-Barnevelt, all became alike involved in it. The country was divided into two hostile parties. They were designated, ecclesiastically, as the Remonstrants and the Contra-Remonstrants; politically, as the supporters of the supremacy of the States of Holland over the other provinces, and those who believed in the parity in authority of all the States. Olden-Barnevelt and Grotius belonged to the one party; Prince Maurice to the other. The strife resulted in the complete overthrow of the former. Olden-Barnevelt was beheaded at the Hague in the 72d year of his age. Grotius and Hogerbeets, Pension-

ary of the city of Leyden, were thrown into prison. The first was condemned to life imprisonment with confiscation of all his property. In The Hague, where his captivity began, he was treated with such rigor that he fell ill. His nearest relations were not permitted to see him. After six months he was removed to the fortress of Louvestein, situated between the rivers Meuse and Waal, on the boundary line separating the provinces of Holland from Gelderland. Here he had more comforts. A daily allowance of forty eight cents had been granted by his judges for his support, but his noble wife, Marie Van Reigersberg, refused to accept it and maintained him and the children from her private means.

During the two years that the imprisonment of Grotius in the Hague and Louvestein lasted, he applied himself most closely to literary labor. The work done by him in that incredibly short period gives evidence not only to his untiring industry but also to his immense learning. In the Hague he had not the use of his library and thus was thrown upon the resources of his own well-stored mind. In regard to his book on "Instruction concerning the Judiciary required in Holland," he touchingly wrote to his three sons Cornelius, Peter and Diederik: "I regret that in the composition of this work I did not have the books necessary for consultation, nor the privilege of conversing with other people concerning the customs and usages of Holland. Acquaint yourselves with experienced judges and in this manner seek to supply all deficiencies. Accept of this as a small legacy in the place of the means which I should have bequeathed to you had I not been deprived of them most unjustly."

Besides the *Instruction*, Grotius composed in this prison poems on "The Virtue of Reticence," "The Lord's Prayer Explained," and other topics. More elaborate, however, than any of them was a catechism for his daughter Cornelia, entitled "Instruction for Baptized Children." The author himself translated it from the Dutch into Latin rhyme, and Francis Goldsmith and Christopher Waze, respectively, rendered it into

the English and the Greek languages. In a letter under date, June 6, 1619, Professor Vossius wrote to Madame De Groot: "It is well known to you with what delight and astonishment every one peruses that which your husband has written for his daughter Cornelia about baptism. I am acquainted with several persons who not only have read it for themselves unto their edification, but moreover, have acknowledged,—though they are not kindly affected towards your husband—that, to be able to indulge in such a place in such sweet reflections and to express them so nobly in verse, must be regarded as a witness to a good conscience, a Christian mind and a remarkable knowledge of divine things."

Again, under date August 23, 1619, he wrote to the same lady: "Every one greatly admires the questions and the answers 'of the baptism.' Surely I know none of the excellent theologians who could have done this work better, or as well. Even your husband's enemies praise it."

This catechism, which is dated November, 1618, the same month that the Synod of Dort began its sessions, is comprised in 185 questions and answers. It commences thus:

My child, dost thou know that thou wert baptized when thou wert very young?

Yes, Father, I understand that this was done.

Dost thou know what it means to be baptized? That my members are besprinkled with pure water. Tell me, by whom was this done?

By one who was sent to preach the Word of God.

Where did this happen?

Where the Lord's people are wont to assemble for divine service.

In whose name wert thou baptized?

In the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

What do I hear? Are there three Gods?

There is only one God and besides Him there is no other.

[ The last answer is supported by ten citations from Scripture,



referred to in foot notes, giving the books, chapters and verses where they are to be found. Indeed, the entire work rests upon the Bible as its foundation. There are only three answers to which one or more proof texts are not attached. The doctrine is systematically unfolded from the statement of the unity of the Godhead, at the beginning, through to the points pertaining to eschatology. The following analysis of the "Instruction" is made from the Dutch original.

#### THE TRINITY.

The world and the Word are God's witnesses, for He speaks and He works. This God is a single, eternal, good, wise and unchangeable Being. Taught by His Word, we make in regard to Him a threefold distinction. The Unity in Trinity cannot be explained, for the Infinite cannot be brought into comparison with the finite. But in one of God's handiworks there is something that furnishes a resemblance: the sun, with its light and heat; these are three, yet one. In man also there is a suggestion of this truth; his soul, his intellect and his will are one, yet distinct. The Father, Son and Holy Spirit are co-equal. They are one in power, in eternity and in dominion. The peculiar attribute of the Father is that He is to all the Source of the life-principle.

#### CREATION.

It is needless to ask how God occupied Himself before He created the world, for God does not require a self-manifestation external to Himself. All things, the earth and the heavens were made by God out of nothing. He adorned them with light, land, water, trees, plants, stars and animals. The spirit of man came from God; his body was made of the earth. Man was made to serve God and to be supremely happy.

#### THE FALL OF MAN.

In that man was made after the divine likeness he was made able to live in all the divine commands. He became wicked

through the fall of Adam and his own personal guilt. God did not leave His creature to his own resources, for, independent of the divine guidance no one can continue to exist. God governs over all, and permits sin, as He, being wise and good, overrules it for good. In His omnipotence God can do everything that is appropriate to Himself.

#### THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

The Son of God, as to His human nature, was born in the fullness of the time. As to His divine nature He is from eternity. From everlasting the Son was the image of the Father, His Counsel, His Word, His Reason. By Him were all things made and without Him nothing exists. He obtained a soul and flesh in that, conceived of the Holy Ghost, He was born of the Virgin Mary, of the seed of David, of the race of Abraham. God and man are not two who came together; they are one Person, the divine and the human in union. The immortal and the mortal did not blend, for there was a union without a mixture. Of this some idea may be formed by considering the soul and the body which together constitute a human being. This Lord is called Jesus because He redeems and delivers us from all evil. He bears the name Christ because God has anointed Him and greatly exalted Him. He fulfilled the office of Redeemer by means of His life, His death and the power of His resurrection.

#### REPENTANCE AND TRUE FAITH.

The fruit of the life of Christ for us is the remembrance of His doctrine and example. He enjoined the knowledge of God and the worship of Him in the Spirit. His worship embraces repentance, faith, and spiritual works. Repentance is sorrow for sin and hatred against it. Saving faith is assent to the truth of God and a resting upon it. The truth grasped by faith is that God will bestow salvation upon us without any merit of our own. The works performed in love are the fruits

of faith and a pathway unto eternal life. We must love our neighbor as ourselves, but God above all.

PRAYER.

God is to be addressed in private prayer, and, in social prayer, for He is the universal Father. We are all to pray for the things whereby His glory and our advantage are promoted. When we pray for the honor of His name, the increase of His kingdom and ability to do His will, we ask for that which tends to His glory. When we ask for the supply of our wants, pardon of sin and deliverance from the evil, we ask for the things that are useful to ourselves. Our prayers must be characterized by humility, sincerity, confidence and brevity. Prayers are not to be addressed to any being but to God alone who is jealous of His honor.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Images are not to be used in the worship of Him who is an invisible Being. Not only they who commit perjury, but they also who swear needlessly are deserving of death. God's people assemble for the observance of the Lord's Supper, the administration of baptism, the giving of alms, the singing of hymns, listening to the truth, and prayer.

THE WORK OF THE MINISTRY.

A preacher's lips should proclaim the Law of the Old Testament and the Covenant of the New. A preacher's teachings are to be received in just so far as they are found to rest on the Word of God. The office of one who addresses a congregation is to speak the things which God spoke, and to be silent about the things about which God is silent. Besides, it is required of him that he have a spotless reputation, an irreproachable behaviour and pure morals. The congregation owe their pastor love, respect and support.

DUTIES ARISING FROM SOCIAL AND POLITICAL RELATIONS.

The duty of children whom God will reward is to love, honor and obey their parents. Parents must provide for their

children that which is needed for their bodies, but especially that which is for their spiritual welfare. Magistrates have been exalted by God in order that they might ensure peaceful lives to the good and be for a terror to evil doers. A citizen owes to the authorities taxes, praise, regard, obedience and honor. The husband who will please God must labor for his daily bread and hold his wife in affection. A maiden's chief ornament is virtue and a modest countenance. A wife leads a Christian life when she educates her children and yields the government to her husband. A widow pursues the right path when she abounds in prayer, avoids luxury and attends to the poor. They who have charge of a family must exercise kindness in ordering their servants, and these must serve, not with eye service but faithfully and diligently. Christ explains the command "Thou shalt not kill," by saying that all hatred and envy are to be avoided, and that, as we desire God to forgive us, it becomes us to pardon those who have injured us. Rather than to retaliate scorn and blows, we are to submit to these, as He teaches us who causes His sun to shine on the evil and on the good. Christ forbids adultery and requires chastity in manners and conversation. The state of virginity renders the service of God the more easy, but they who marry do not thereby displease God. They who do marry have no right to separate except on the ground of adultery. The grace of abiding in celibacy has not been bestowed upon every one. He who acquires property unlawfully is a thief. A person should be on his guard against a superabundance of earthly goods. The rich enter heaven with difficulty. They are not to be proud of their wealth, but to impart generously to those who need. Cheerful alms-giving is pleasing to God, and not that which is practiced for the sake of thanks or commendation. Fear of want in old age should not be a hindrance to charity. As we have food, clothing, shelter, there is no cause for complaint. He who feeds the birds and clothes the flowers, cares for His people. We are not to be over-anxious in regard to temporal things. We should give attention to the present but let God care for the morrow.

## THE CHRISTIAN'S WALK.

A Christian must refrain from lying, strife, and gossiping. In jests, all uncleanness is to be avoided, for it shall be condemned. A human being is to seek his joy in the praise of God, in the reading of the Word of God, and in mutual exhortation to piety. Guilt may be contracted by silence when the honor due to God, or to a fellow-man, may suffer thereby. Man is responsible for his secret desires, for, when these are evil, the law of God is broken. Man deceives himself through the pride of the world, the lust of the flesh, and the desire of the eyes. The soul comes to the extreme of distress when its desires have begotten crime and crime has begotten death. The greatest of all Christian attainments is to mortify self, and to take up the cross. The man whom Christ calls blessed is sober, pure, hungering after righteousness, poor in spirit, peaceful and gentle. They who suffer for His name's sake shall rejoice together with the prophets. They who feed, clothe, lodge and visit the poor and the sick, shall hereafter stand at the right hand of the Son of God. To these teachings the Father, Christ Himself, and the Holy Spirit have added their testimony: the Father, in that He plainly declared that He was well pleased with the Son; the Son, in that He followed-up His own instructions with abundant works; the Holy Ghost, in that He wrought in the Son to do many wonderful works. As a witness to His doctrine Christ raised the dead and healed the sick.

## THE PASSION OF CHRIST.

The example of Christ is not the only fruit of His life, for His righteousness is imputed to us. Our Lord came to His death at the hands of the Jews, acting through a Roman governor named Pontius Pilate. The wicked people spat upon Him and mocked Him, and even beat Him with rods. After this outrageous treatment, they slew Him by nailing His hands and His feet to the cross. It is certain that He gave up the ghost, for this was a terror to the sun and the earth. After

His decease, His body was deposited in a tomb which had been given for the purpose. The passion of Christ was not merely in the physical agony which He endured. His soul was anguished, grieved, and terribly burdened. Although the Son of God was innocent, He was permitted thus to suffer that He might deliver us from our sins. Except that precious blood had been shed, there could have been no mercy, for the divine righteousness must be satisfied. His sacrifice was sufficient for all sins, for it was a perfect sacrifice. This passion should urge us to the exercise of love, humility, patience and obedience.

#### THE EXALTATION OF CHRIST.

Christ did not remain subject to death and the grave. The third day He was seen alive again. By His resurrection Christ was declared to be the Son of God. He remained on earth in the sight of His disciples only for the space of forty days. When He left this world He ascended on a cloud to heaven, where He is seated on the right hand of God. He is exalted above the angels, for the dominion over them has been given to Him. In the abode of His Father He thinks of us, for He is there as our Priest and King. As our Priest He intercedes for us in virtue of His shed blood. As our King he provides for us, and defends us against our enemies. He remains in the heavens until He shall come a second time on the clouds, in order to judge in righteousness the quick and the dead.

#### THE HOLY GHOST.

The Holy Spirit who also is mentioned in the form of baptism, is the substantial Power of the Father and the Son. Men had a knowledge of the Spirit before the time of Christ, for it was by Him that the prophets spake. The apostles were favored beyond the prophets, in that they received the Spirit in greater measure, and had the power of communicating Him. The most beautiful rays of this fire were healing, prophesying, exorcising, speaking with tongues. But though these gifts have ceased, the Spirit still works, in that at the present time He aches and comforts men. It is true that we receive spiritual

instruction from the Word, but the letter without the Spirit cannot give life. No man has ever in his own strength exercised faith, for no man can call Christ Lord, except by the Spirit of the Lord. Our mere intelligence suffices not to come to this knowledge, for the natural man cannot discern spiritual things. The Spirit enlightens our intellects and renews our hearts.

MAN'S CONVERSION.

When man believes, God must still strengthen him, for He must work not only to will but also to do. The man himself must work after God has begun to work in him, for he receives as he asks and finds as he seeks. When man is conscious of a resisting energy, God will give him power to overcome by means of watching and praying. The Spirit comforts us in that He assures us that God will always remain our Heavenly Father.

THE CATHOLICITY OF THE CHURCH.

The Spirit's presence is in His church, which He has gathered and which He extends to every part of the earth where Christ is known. The Jews were of old God's covenant people, but Christ has broken down the wall of partition. The Jewish law is no longer of the same force, because the new covenant has abolished it. Circumcision and the Sabbath were the shadows of the substance which we now have.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.

God's people must communicate to one another of temporal good, but especially of spiritual things. To this fellowship the body and the precious blood of Christ give witness. These are enjoyed, so long after the death of Christ, in the grateful remembrance thereof by means of the bread and the wine. As bread and wine nourish the body, so the flesh and blood of Christ nourish the soul. The bread is one and the wine is one, because we all are members of one body.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

Among God's people are the weak and the evil, who are, the former, to be gently endured, and the latter, to be charitably

### *The Prison-work of Hugo Grotius.*

judged. If any of the latter injure us in our possessions or reputation, we must first admonish them in private; then, in the presence of two persons, and, finally, in the presence of a greater number. If any of these be obdurate or commit grievous sins, he must be cut off as a stranger in God's church. In this condition he must remain until he show repentance. This course is ratified by God Himself.

#### BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

This Christian association is entered by means of baptism. Children are baptized in their earliest infancy, to teach them thereby that they belong to God. Though it appears that faith should precede baptism, yet, in the case of infants, the faith of the parents avails for them. Baptism signifies the divine gifts of pardon, regeneration and resurrection. The forgiveness of sins is signified by baptism because God takes away guilt even as the water removes foul stains.

#### THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS.

The remission of sins is by no means merited by any thing we can do, but it is a gift of free grace. He who obtained for us this blessing is the Lord Jesus, who shed His blood. The persons whose sins God forgives are those who mourn over their sinful lives and believe with assured confidence. The act of pardon is repeated as often as there is a serious turning away from sin.

#### THE BAPTISM OF ADULTS.

Baptism resembles regeneration in that the Christian dies even as a person strangles in the water. A Christian indeed lives, but no more to himself nor to sin. He lays off the old man as being crucified and buried with Christ. He who is born again puts on a new life after the example of Him who called him. But he is not thus delivered henceforth from all care, for a severe conflict remains between the Spirit and the flesh. The weapons which are to be used in the conflict with the flesh are fasting, gospel-peace, the Word of God, faith and prayer. Any



one who thinks that a Christian is ever perfect here, makes a great mistake. The new man has the advantage over the old in that sin does not retain the dominion over him. He who is imperfect is still pleasing to God, for God bears with him in his weakness for Christ's sake.

#### THE LAST THINGS.

Baptism also points at the resurrection, for, as divers come out of the sea, so shall we arise. When the soul has departed from the body, it remains with Christ until the last day. On that day the trumpets of the angels shall wake the dead, who shall arise to receive a righteous reward according to their works. The Lord shall consign His enemies to the eternal fire. For His people the good God has prepared happiness without any sorrow, for soul and body. The body, which has wasted away, shall be brought up, even as the grain which has decayed reappears in the ears. In the next life it shall not be with the body as it was here, for it shall be immortal, full of power, heavenly and glorious.

#### THE FUTURE LIFE.

In the next life men shall not marry, nor eat nor drink, for they shall be as the angels of God. The sun nor the moon shall shine, for God shall be their eternal light. The joy which awaits God's people cannot be explained, for eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man.

The "Instruction" closes with the injunction: "See to it, that you live a life consistent with your baptism." The answer is an affirmation in a form the remembrance of which in after life by the one who made it in his youth, must have tended to the awakening of serious thoughts upon the awful consequences following upon a failure to keep so solemn a promise,—*"So help me He who has commanded me to do this."*

A far more elaborate work than the "Instruction" was "Evidences of the True Religion," composed in 1620 in the prison at Louvestein. It was avowedly written for the benefit

of sailors, who, in the course of their long voyages might gather from it a sufficient knowledge of the truths of the Christian religion. That the contents of the volume might the better be retained in the memory, they were presented in rhyme. The work was received with universal favor, for the reason that it treated of the fundamental truths in which Christians of different denominations were agreed; that its style was characterized by great clearness and simplicity; and that all allusions to the sharp controversies of the times were carefully avoided. Several translations were made of it. Grotius himself rendered it, in 1627, into Latin prose, and enriched it by the addition of several learned notes. This work he did at the request of Hieronymus Bignon, a counsellor of the French king. From this Latin version French and English translations were made; the former by Curcelæus. A clerical member of the English embassy in France put it into Greek, and two German translations appeared from the hands, respectively, of Martinus Opitius and Christophorus Colerus. It was also set over into the Persian language, in the hope that it might reach some of the followers of Mahomet. The original Dutch work came to a third edition already in 1683. Subsequently, a Dutch prose version was prepared by J. Oudaan.

These attempts to place the "Evidences" before the greatest possible number of readers, while intimating the appreciation in which they are held must possibly justify the extravagant language which Kaspar Brandt employed in regard to them. "The phoenix of his time," he says, "for whom the world was too small, could not be immured within the walls of Louvestein. His spirit pierced through the stone walls. That subtle intellect caused its voice to be heard throughout the earth. That valorous hero in the arena of letters pressed on through extensive tracts of paper in order to serve his country, which was too ungrateful to acknowledge his services and too blind to perceive them. His divine intellect poured out upon these pages a stream of golden lessons, so that all who love learning might gather literary treasures. The soul, full of courage and zeal,

escaped from the prison and passed beyond the cerulean arches, so that, with eyes undimmed by dungeon-damp, it might see God clothed in light unapproachable. His vision having been clarified he applied himself to the erection of a temple for the King of kings. Like a second Chrysostom he sought to disclose the wonders contained in the sacred pages, the glories of the covenant of grace. O small volume written by a very great man, thou hadst thy birth within a contracted space! O jewel of a book, the chosen of thousands, in thee the brilliancy of the Christian faith is exhibited as to the eyes of all nations! In thee is the power of the beneficent Pentecostal fire. Thou suppliest material to learned interpreters of the Scriptures. A flood of wisdom rushes through thy leaves; a wisdom to which all the foolishness of Athens must yield, and which is as a brighter sun by which all heathendom may be gilded. Before thee the slanderous tongue of Celsus is struck dumb. By thee Porphyry is compelled to abandon his idols. Prince Julian who, in his pride, spat in the face of his Lord, raised from the abyss, willingly bows before the dear cross, more worthy than imperial thrones, as he reads this noble work. How could he with such a book have justified his infidelity? This daylight is too strong for the Stygian night. The crescent of Mecca is obscured. The law of blood, which is spread by means of the sword and the torch, loses its prestige. The fierce lion yields to the sacrificial lamb. O seed of Abraham, extinguish the lamp of your temple, for the sun breaks through the fog of your traditions and shows you King Messiah whom you expect! O golden book, worthy of being read by every one! O jewel of the church! O precious token of literary genius! O silvermine which cannot be praised too much! O example of the keenest intellect, thou hast been translated into seven languages because of thy value! Thou art the most beautiful thing seen by Christendom. In the fair language of the Netherlands thou shinest with a special glory. Let Grotius be imperishable. The splendor of his name outlasts all envy and survives even the walls of Louvestein Castle."

The work is divided into six books. We propose to give the subjects treated in each, together with analytical statements of the mode in which each is disposed of. The author's thoughts upon those topics which, from a controversial or a polemical point of view, continue to enlist a special attention, will be presented in detail.

The first book treats of the existence, the unity and the perfectness of the Godhead. It replies to the objection raised against the holiness of God on the ground of the existence of evil. The opinion, held by some, that there are two mutually independent principles of good and evil is refuted. The government of God over the world in respect to generals and particulars, is proven by the changes to which earthly governments are subject, as recorded in history; by the miraculous works done by God at different times; by the witness which the immortality of the religion revealed to the Jews bears to its truthfulness; by the antiquity and trust-worthiness of the Mosaic records, and by the prophecies addressed to God's covenant people. Finally, objections drawn from the cessation of miracles, the prevalence of sin and the tribulations of the righteous are answered.

In regard to the cavalier's inquiry concerning the origin of evil,—if God is infinitely good whence comes it?—Grotius asks: What do you understand by evil? Is it that which is unpleasant? Bitter herbs have no agreeable taste, yet tincture of rhubarb restores health to the body. Parental discipline, judicial punishment, cannot be called evil. But if by evil you mean that which is done improperly and contrary to law,—well, the power thereto indeed comes from God, for when He created us He bestowed upon us the free power of choice to live in this wise or otherwise. But he who chooses the evil is himself the cause of it, since he employs unto evil that which he should have employed unto good. Carefully distinguish between the two, for, between God and evil is human liberty.

That the exercise of authority among men and the changes that occur in earthly governments testify to a universal divine

rule, Grotius shows in this manner: Hundreds of thousands of men, and these adults, have respect to a child twelve years of age. Though only a few persons who are consumed with a desire to enrich themselves with the possessions of others, are required to overcome the magistrates, yet, from fear of them they refrain from robbery. For a period of 1300 years the Assyrian Kingdom stood; so also the Egyptian and the Gallic. What of Venice? When it pleases God to overthrow a throne nothing can prevent Him. Cyrus, the nurseling of a dog, overthrew the Medes. The Macedonian hero fought his way from Greece to the Ganges. Look at Cæsar. He came, he saw, he conquered. Neither German campaigns; nor the cunning of Pompey; nor the mutiny of his own people; nor thirst and hunger; nor the violence of Pharnaces, King of Pontus; nor the opposition of Juba, King of Mauritania; nor the wiles of the Egyptians could avail to impede his course. Rome was forced to bend to his yoke. Even Cato could retain his freedom from that yoke only by killing himself. How is it that the firmament, the floods, men, bow to one man even deeper than he desires. Say what you will,—it is not by chance that a throw of the dice results in double sixes.

To the argument that, if the performance of miracles in past times proved a particular Providence, the cessation of such wonderworks at present shows that the latter exists no longer, Grotius replies: Let no one imagine that, when heat constantly follows cold, the night succeeds the day, and for so long a time affairs pursue their ordinary path, the all-seeing Eye of the Lord of the world ceases to watch. The captain of a ship does not alter his course without a good reason. A King does not depart, except on special grounds, from a law which he enacted only upon mature deliberation. Why should God lightly change the order of things which testifies to His wisdom? He has shown in the past by many wonderworks, that He has the power to change the order of things and that He keeps his Eye fixed upon all human activity. Now what He did from wise purposes in the past, He refrains from doing in the present from

wise purposes also ; since His understanding does not fail Him now any more than it did then, nor is His power shortened.

The second book is apologetic of the Christian religion. The life of Christ ; the miracles which He performed, not through an inherent natural strength, nor by means of diabolical arts, but in the exertion of a divine power, and on account of which all good people worship Him ; His death and the credibility of the testimony to His resurrection,—serve to show the genuineness of this religion. They who say that the resurrection is an impossibility are dislodged from their position. The resurrection of Christ is indeed a confirmation of the verity of His doctrine. Four arguments are presented in support of the superiority of the Christian religion over all others. These are,—the excellence of the reward which it holds up ; the holiness of its precepts ; the exalted character of its Teacher ; and the surprising rapidity of its spread notwithstanding the weakness of its first heralds and the obstacles placed in the way of it. The inability to explain how our decayed frames can be restored and recognized, does not detract from the force of the first argument ; nor does the fact that there is so much debate among its professors, brought against the fourth argument, indicate the instability of the religion of Christ.

In reference to the denial of the trust-worthiness of Christ's resurrection, Grotius says : If any one should say that the testimony of a thousand people does not avail in respect to things which *cannot* occur, let him consider that he should distinguish between things which are utterly impossible, as for example, that a report should be both true and false ; and, on the other hand, those which are *beyond* human comprehension. That it is impossible that one be dead and alive at the same time, no person will deny, but, that God from whom life was derived at first, cannot restore it to him from whom it was taken ; or, that the restoration to life is an evidence of its never really having been destroyed, no one in his senses can maintain. If the restoration of life to the dead were impossible, Plato would not have mentioned the case of Er, in his tenth book of

The Republic; nor would Heraclides have spoken of a woman who was brought back to life seven days after her decease; nor would Herodotus have believed the restoration of Aristeus, nor Plutarch that of Chæroneus.

With those who hold to the impossibility of the resurrection of the body, the author of the "Evidences" argues thus: Unbelief makes a great tumult about the impossibility of the resurrection of the body after a long time. I admit that it is incomprehensible. It is not impossible. Experience teaches us that in the world nothing is lost. The forms of things change. Underneath the form is the substance which, assuming different shapes, continues to exist. Suppose a body be destroyed by fire. In the case of wood there are smoke, ashes and steam. Suppose a body be decomposed in the sea, or in the grave, or be eaten by whales, lions, or birds of prey. Suppose that in the course of time the external form of it utterly disappears, nevertheless the substance remains. Should not He who sees everything and forgets nothing, know where every particle is? Has He not the power to force the atmosphere, the earth, the fire, or whatever it may be, to restore, after a variety of changes, the man whom He created and whom He only gave in trust to them; even as the Alchymist by his skill causes quicksilver to bring lost substances back to their original condition? See how the seed, cast in the soil, comes back in the harvest after its own kind. You cannot tell by the appearance of an egg that it comes from a hen, nevertheless it does come from a hen, and a hen comes from it. Why should not He who made all things out of nothing, once more restore the rejected and the scattered particles? But now, says one, look at the cannibal who has made a meal of a human being; there are fishes which devour people, and these identical fishes appear on the tables of other people; now how can it be that one and the same particle should be incorporated with you and me? It should be considered of that which enters the stomach but little is assimilated with the body. A great deal passes off by different channels. Much goes into the outer air by means of perspiration, expiration, rejected nails

and hair. Now since God has not designed that man should subsist upon human flesh, it may be that the particles of a human body, taken into another body, are expelled from it as completely as medicines or poisons are.

The third book relates to Biblical criticism, especially that of the New Testament. The credibility of the New Testament Scriptures is shown. The books contained in them are of two kinds: first, those in regard to whose authors there were some doubts—which doubts, however, as the result of careful investigation, quickly disappeared—; secondly, those which were free from such uncertainties. Every book of the New Testament was written by the person whose name it bears. These writers had a knowledge of the things which they recorded; they scorned lying; they performed miracles; the predictions contained in these books were fulfilled. God exercised a preserving care over these books, so that the canonical Scriptures were kept free from errors. The very assaults that were made upon these books serve to increase the belief in their trustworthiness.

To the objections that some of these books are properly rejected; that others contain impossible things; and that others still are full of contradictory matter, Grotius answers: If any one say that impossible things are found in these books, let him consider that it has already been shown that God can raise up the dead when it pleases Him, and that the power of God is not limited in its exercise to the capabilities of things inherent in themselves. If it be said, moreover, that things are mentioned which are inconsistent with reason, I deny this on the ground that in that case it would be incomprehensible how so many intelligent creatures should have suffered themselves to be directed by the Scriptures. Besides, what basis for this objection, when it has already been shown to be in full accord with reason that there is a God; that He must be one, perfect, infinite, wise, eternal, powerful, good; that He made all existing things; that He continues to exercise a preserving care over them; that He can reward us as to our souls and bodies; that we are



under compulsion to keep His commands; that we must live soberly and love our neighbors. All this is plainly taught in the books of the Christian religion. To penetrate under the guidance of reason alone into the nature of the Divine Being, is very dangerous. This is evident from the fact that the same things which one protests against, another praises. There is a constant conflict between conjectures. As they stand in slippery paths, even the wisest men vary in their opinions when they undertake to investigate the nature of their own souls. How much more then is this to be expected when the subject of study is the Being of God. Whoever begins to conjecture about the secret counsels of a great earthly king only arrives at self-deception. How then could we find out Him whose wisdom is unfathomable? Plato, therefore, justly observes that we cannot know more about these matters than has been revealed to us. Now, of God's revelation we could not have had a clearer perception given us than that which was to be obtained in the time of the Christian dispensation. It cannot be shown that God ever declared to man anything about His being that is in conflict with the teachings of the New Testament, or that in later times He imposed upon mankind a different code of laws. The ancient precepts do not make the Christian dispensation of no effect. Things indifferent, devoid of the moral qualities of good and evil, may be easily imposed at one time and abolished at another. God might at one time overlook a defect, and at another time sharply enjoin the avoidance of it. Now in such a case judicial codes teach us that the old law must yield to the newer enactments.

If any one say that the writers of the Scriptures often contradict one another, I answer that in these seeming contradictions themselves there is additional proof to their genuineness. Never were any persons more in agreement than the teachers of the cross. Neither the disciples of Shammai, nor those of Hillel, were in such close harmony. One follower of Hippocrates differed from another. Xenophon steps aside from the teachings of Plato. Chrysippus is in conflict with Cleanthes.

The teachers of Roman jurisprudence go apart from one another. Ulpianus does not agree with himself. Aristotle maintains in one place what he protests against in another. But our authors, in all points relating to faith and practice, are agreed. In respect to Christ's life, death and resurrection they give, in the main, one narrative. Now, as to diversities in reference to place where, time when, and manner how, it might easily be that events, in which there was a circumstantial similarity, happened twice; or that a person and a place had two distinct names; and the like, so that one who knew everything about a given case, could easily furnish the explanation of a discrepancy. These discrepancies rather indicate that there was no conspiracy to produce a harmonious narrative. If deception had been intended, there would have been collusion, so that there would have been no possibility of variation. If such a rigid rule as it is designed to apply to the Scripture, is to be applied to all books, then not a single book would be deemed worthy of confidence, for in every book there are minor discrepancies in respect to localities and places; yet, we accept Dionysius Halicarnassus, Polibius, and Titus Livius.

The second half of the work is devoted to the refutation of Paganism, Judaism, and Mahometanism. In the fourth book it is shown that there is no justification for the worship of the dead; nor of the heavenly bodies; fire, earth, air, water and the like; nor of animals. Pagan worship declined with the decay of the nations that were addicted to it. Some of the principal teachings of the Christian religion have their concurrence in the utterances of the wisest heathen. Much of that which is found in the Pagan writings is as hard to be believed as the most difficult things for which the Christian religion claims our faith.

In regard to the allegation that the heathen performed miracles and that they had their oracles, Grotius says: If any boast of the wonderful works done by heathen gods, we reply that we could mention many learned men in great renown among the heathen who declare that these reports are false.

Much, too, that has been done was transacted in dark caverns, or in the night, or in the presence of only a few persons whom the priests, bringing their trickery to the aid of their avarice, deceived. Sometimes these wonderful things were done by men who had much knowledge of the natural properties of objects, and the ignorant common people beheld only the mere results; as for example, if one were to show a magnet attracting iron, how astonished they would be who had no knowledge of its properties. Thus Simon Magus and Apollonius Tyanas acquired a very great reputation. Besides, evil spirits who have far more knowledge than any human being, could easily lend their aid to the sorcerers; and finally, God might easily permit men, as a punishment for their apostacy, blindly to fall into the deception of devils, or He might do some wonder-works among the heathen, so that, in the general darkness these luminous sparks might testify to His omnipotence.

The fifth book deals with Judaism. The descendants of Abraham, according to the flesh are urged to receive the miracles of Christ as a sufficient witness to Him. These were not wrought by magic. The evidence of the divinity of the power by which Christ performed them, lies in the fact that He insisted upon the worship of the one true God. If any say that the law of Christ and that of Moses do not agree, he is told that the former is superior. Christ kept the Mosaic law, fulfilling all righteousness. Still, He was pleased to abolish those precepts which in themselves were not possessed of any inherent virtue. The sacrifices were no longer required when the design of their appointment had been reached. Distinctions between days and between different kinds of food disappeared. Circumcision, as an initiatory rite, was no longer enjoined. The first preachers of the Christian dispensation often practiced the greatest forbearance and charity towards the Jews. The latter still look for a Messiah. But He has already come. The predictions concerning Him, that received their fulfillment, prove that He is the Anointed. It is not, as some say, that the sins of the Jews have deferred the Messiah's coming, but, that

their present wretched condition shows that they are punished for rejecting the Messiah when He *had* come. After considering the objections that some of the predictions concerning Christ have not been fulfilled ; that Christ's state in the world was one of humiliation ; that they who slew Him were impelled to the deed by piety ; that Christians worship three Gods instead of one ; and that, in worshipping Christ they are guilty of idolatry, the author utters a fervent prayer for his brethren of Israel that the veil may be taken from their hearts.

The position taken by some Jewish opponents that Christ performed his miracles by means of magic, is thus shown to be untenable : You claim that Christ did His wonder-works by means of magic which He learned in Egypt. The Kingdom of Satan is overthrown, not confirmed, wherever the doctrines of Christ are accepted. Besides, while Christ was still an infant, He left Egypt. The fact is that the precepts of Moses and of Christ both denounce magic. Further, if Christ healed the blind and the lame by means of magic, would not the Roman emperors, who hotly pursued every kind of novelty, have sought to acquire the same power ? You acknowledge that the Sanhedrin certainly could recognize magic when it existed. If, then, Christ practiced it, would not the Sanhedrin have charged Him with this in order to bring Him into disgrace ?

In the sixth book, after giving an account of the rise of Mahometanism, Grotius proceeds in a number of arguments against the followers of the false prophet. These arguments are chiefly in the form of contrasts drawn between the person of Christ and that of Mahomet ; the miracles performed by each ; the precepts enjoined by each ; the first converts gathered by each ; and the agencies employed for the spread of the doctrines of each. Grotius closes the volume with an exhortation to the Christians of his native land to be faithful in their obedience, and to be earnest and devoted in their religion and their patriotism.

After the captivity of a year and a half at Louvestein, Grotius unexpectedly regained his liberty through the cunning

of his wife. On March 22, 1621, a heavy chest was carried out of the fortress and placed on board of a vessel lying in the stream whose waters washed the foundation-walls of the prison. They who bore the box and complained of its weight, thought that the imprisoned scholar had finished an unusually large number of books. They were carrying the scholar himself. The vessel reached Gornichem whither it was bound. The chest was taken to the house of David Daatzelaar who was in the secret. Thence Grotius, dressed like a mason, fled to France where he was kindly received by the king and had a pension assigned him for his comfortable support. After a variety of fortunes the relation of which does not lie within the scope of this article, he died in 1645. Though not so much by means of the two works that have been reviewed, as by means of other contributions from his pen, De Groot still continues to exert an influence upon dogmatic theology and the interpretation of the Scripture.

#### IV.

### OTTERBEIN AND THE REFORMED CHURCH.

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, D.D.

THE Reverend William Otterbein, an eminent minister of the Reformed Church, has been generally claimed as the founder of the religious denomination known as the "United Brethren in Christ." In support of this claim statements have been made which reflect seriously on the history and character of the Reformed Church. It has, for instance, been confidently asserted that, in consequence of his extraordinary piety, Otterbein was grievously persecuted and driven into schism.\* While we do not deny his active participation in a religious movement, originally confined to the Reformed Church, but subsequently extending beyond its limits, which finally resulted in the organization of a separate religious denomination, we think it can be shown that Otterbein was a faithful member of the Reformed Coetus (or Synod); that he possessed the confidence of his brethren; and that he never proposed to sever his connection with the church of his fathers. This subject has been frequently discussed, but the recent discovery of important documents renders it worthy of renewed attention.

William Otterbein was born June 3d, 1726, at Dillenburg, in Nassau, where his father was rector of the Latin school. In baptism he was named "Philip William," but for some unknown reason he dropped the first of these names in later life. His father and grandfather were Reformed ministers, and five of his brothers also assumed the sacred office. Concerning his

\* See Hanby, in Rupp's "Hist of Rel. Denominations," *et al.*

early youth we have little knowledge ; but it is certain that he enjoyed the priceless blessing of a Christian home. In 1742 we find him studying at Herborn, an institution which was then attended by many students of theology. In 1748 he was recognized as a Candidate of Theology, at Dillenburg, and was in the same year a teacher at Herborn. One year later he was ordained, and became vicar of the church at Ockersdorf.

When Schlatter visited Europe, Otterbein was but twenty-six years old ; but he was full of missionary enthusiasm, and joined the band of six young ministers who heeded the call to labor in America. Immediately on his arrival in this country, in 1752, he was called to the pastorate of the church of Lancaster, which was then, next to Philadelphia, the most important Reformed congregation in Pennsylvania. His immediate predecessors, Vock and Schnorr, appear to have been unworthy men, who had left the congregation rent and distracted. Neither of them had brought testimonials from Germany, and the latter seems to have been an unordained pretender ; but the lack of ministers was so great that people were easily deceived, and were only too ready to take their own way without consulting coetus. Some of the best members had therefore withdrawn from the congregation, while others had become so demoralized that they were unwilling to submit to proper ecclesiastical discipline.\*

In assuming the charge of such a congregation, Otterbein undertook a difficult task ; but he appears to have been very successful, though he evidently met with occasional discouragements. During his ministry a church was erected which remained standing until 1853. Dr. Harbaugh gives him the credit of imparting to the congregation " consolidation, firmness, and character," and in the minutes of coetus for 1757 he is called " a most excellent pastor."

In the latter year he expressed a wish to resign, complaining especially of a lack of discipline in the congregation ; but the coetus declined to dissolve the pastoral relation. The people

\* See Letter of Rev. J. B. Rieger, in Saur's Paper, 1751.

were also unwilling to give him up, and personally signed a document, which is still extant, in which they pledged themselves to submit to proper discipline in the observance of the Lord's Supper. He therefore withdrew his resignation and continued his pastoral labors.

Besides preaching regularly in Lancaster and New Providence, Otterbein was, in 1755, appointed a member of two committees of supply, which rendered it necessary for him to preach in Reading and in Conewago (now Christ church, Adams county), as long as these churches remained vacant. In the following year he was directed to supply the charge, in York county, made vacant by the deposition of Rev. Jacob Lischy. It was in the performance of these duties that he engaged in the "itinerant labors" to which he referred in his old age as having been undertaken while he was pastor in Lancaster; but it should be remembered that all this was done at the direction of the authorities of the Church. In 1757 he was elected President of Coetus.

One year later, in 1758, Otterbein left Lancaster, it would seem, rather abruptly. He had intended to visit his friends in Europe, but was prevented, it is said, by a war which was then raging. Steiner, however, in his reply to a letter received from Otterbein—reproving him for irregularly accepting a call from Philadelphia—says rather sharply: "If I were to make myself a judge of your conduct I would say: 'Your departure from Lancaster, and your delay in making your proposed journey to the Fatherland do not please me.' . . . But as I do not know your private motives, I cannot presume to judge."\*

From 1758 to 1760, Otterbein was pastor at Tulpehocken. During this period he received the usual Holland stipend, the first year £30, and the second £37 10s. He is said, in the minutes of coetus, to have labored "with a blessing." In 1759 he declined a call to Frederick, Maryland, partly in deference to the wishes of the people of Tulpehocken, and partly because he still expected to visit his friends in Germany. Early

\* *Mayer MSS.*, I., 114.



in 1760 a letter was addressed by the coetus to the Synod of Holland, in which the following passage appears: "We announce with pleasure that Domine Otterbein has determined to remain longer with us. He still labors with great energy and success in Tulpehocken. Occasionally he makes a journey to Fredericktown, in Maryland, in order to keep together the sheep who were left without a shepherd by Domine Steiner, and to feed them with the word of God."

The call from Frederick was renewed later in the same year, and the coetus then declared it advisable that he should accept it "on account of the isolated position of that church."

In obedience to this judgment Otterbein removed to Frederick, where he remained five years. Here, as elsewhere, the church prospered under his care. A church and parsonage were erected, which in their day were regarded as buildings of a very superior order. There are traditions of conflicts, but they do not appear to be sustained by reliable evidence. It is probable, indeed, that in erecting a church and a parsonage within five years, he encountered some opposition; but the fact that in 1761 he declined an urgent call from the church of Reading indicates that he was at that time satisfied with his charge. In 1763 he received a call from the Reformed Church of Philadelphia and was requested by coetus to become its pastor. This call he retained for a long time, and was evidently inclined to accept it, but there was some opposition to his coming "because his voice was weak."\* When he finally declined, Dr. Weyberg was chosen pastor.

On the 19th of April, 1762, Mr. Otterbein was married in Lancaster, Pa., to Miss Susan Le Roy. She was probably a daughter, or grand-daughter, of Jean Jacques Le Roy, an Indian trader who was killed by the savages at Mahoning in 1755, and whose family subsequently resided in Lancaster.† The fact that Otterbein had at this time reached the mature age of thirty-six lends color to the rather coarse state ment contained

\* Mayer MSS.

† Rupp's "History of Lancaster County," p. 354.

in a letter addressed by the church at Amwell, New Jersey, to the Synods of Holland, in the same year, that "Domine Otterbein has entered the state of matrimony in deference to public opinion, which in America requires that a minister should be a married man." We know nothing further concerning Otterbein's domestic relations, except that his wife died April 27th, 1768, aged 32 years and 5 months.\* He remained a widower for the rest of his life. In the "Holland Report" for 1773 the "Fathers" say: "We are all married men, except Domine Otterbein, and most of us are blessed with children."

From 1765 to 1774 Otterbein was pastor of the Reformed Church of York, Pennsylvania. In 1770 and 1771 he was absent on a visit to his relatives in Germany, but his people would not give him up, and the church was supplied, at their request, by the members of coetus.†

We are inclined to doubt the stories which are related concerning the "big meetings" which Otterbein is said to have conducted at this early period. He was no doubt more inclined to "Pietism" than some of his brethren, though not to such an extent as to come into conflict with them; and it is, of course, possible that he may occasionally have participated in "union meetings," but it accords better with ascertained facts to believe that those meetings which have become historical occurred somewhat later than has been hitherto supposed. Tradition is almost sure to antedate events.

In 1774 Otterbein received a call from the Second Reformed Church of the City of Baltimore. As this may properly be regarded as the turning-point in his career, it becomes necessary to go back a few years to consider the circumstances which led to this event.

The Reformed Church of Baltimore was founded at least as early as 1750. For some years it appears to have been irregularly supplied, but in 1757 the Rev. John Christopher Faber

\* Records of the Reformed Church of Lancaster.

† Minutes of Coetus, 1770.

was elected pastor. He was a man of some culture, but his preaching was not acceptable, and it was asserted by his opponents that he lacked an earnest appreciation of the character of his office. Another ground of objection, according to a statement subsequently entered by Otterbein on the records of his congregation, was found in the fact that he was not a member of coetus. In 1770, Faber's unpopularity became so great that a large portion of the congregation demanded his resignation or removal. This party was greatly pleased with the earnest and enthusiastic preaching of a man named Benedict Schwob, Schwope, or Swope,\* who resided somewhere in the neighborhood of Baltimore. The latter had already applied for ordination to the Reformed Coetus, and it seems likely that he had occasionally occupied the pulpit of the church in Baltimore.

Of the early life of Mr. Schwope little is known. Dr. Harbaugh and other writers, on the authority, apparently, of Mr. Asbury, call him "a young minister recently arrived from Germany;" but this is a mistake. No doubt he was a native of Germany, but the records of St. Benjamin's Church, near Westminster, Maryland, show that he was, as early as 1763, a ruling elder of that congregation. It appears from his extant manuscript that he was very imperfectly educated. In those days it was not unusual for ruling elders to instruct the congregation in the absence of a regular pastor; and it was probably while laboring in this capacity that Mr. Schwope manifested the oratorical talent which subsequently enabled him to become a very popular preacher. In Baltimore, many of the Reformed people were delighted with his discourses, contrasting them with those of Mr. Faber, which they declared to be cold and heartless. An effort was accordingly made to displace Mr. Faber, but it turned out that he had more friends than had been supposed, and the effort proved a failure. Then the dissatisfied party withdrew, and built a small church, of which Mr.

\* The name was variously written, even by its owner. No doubt it was originally *Schwab*.

Schwope became pastor, though as yet he had not received ordination. Neither party, however, regarded the separation as permanent, and, by mutual consent, the whole matter was referred to the coetus for adjudication. Simultaneously Mr. Schwop renewed his application for ordination, and we find the following action on the minutes of the coetus held in Philadelphia in 1770 :

"Mr. Schwop, who had been previously examined at the Coetus of Germantown, applied to Coetus for ordination, and offered to submit to another examination. The reasons for his application were considered, and it was resolved, by a majority of votes, that after his difficulties have been investigated he shall be ordained, as soon as possible after an examination by Domines Pomp and Hendel ; provided that the commissioners appointed for the investigation of his difficulties, Domines Gross and Gobrecht, offer no objections, and regard it as advisable in consequence of the circumstances of the county and of the churches. The want of faithful teachers, especially in Maryland, induces us to accept as our brother every one who may become a worthy instrument in building up and advancing the kingdom of God. We hope this of Mr. Schwop, and therefore trust that the Reverend Fathers will not be surprised at our action, but will rather approve it, especially as we seek nothing thereby but the salvation of souls and the honor of our God."

On another page of the same minutes we find the following account of the manner in which the difficulties in the church of Baltimore were brought to the attention of the coetus :

"Two members of the church in Baltimore, on their own responsibility, presented various complaints against Mr. Faber, to the following effect:—that Mr. Faber is neither sufficiently serious in his conduct, nor sufficiently earnest and zealous in his official functions. On the other hand, Mr. Faber brought several charges against the complainants, and also against Mr. Schwop (a man who preaches in that neighborhood), for having caused disturbance in his congregation. It was therefore resolved, that inasmuch as these ministers have submitted to the judgment of coetus without being members thereof, the matter be taken into consideration, and the complaints and defences of both parties be considered. As the coetus was unable minutely to understand the course which affairs had taken, and inasmuch as both parties claimed to be able to produce witnesses, Domines Gros and Gobrecht were directed to visit these congregations, to examine the case minutely, to decide according to their best judgment, and to report to coetus."

The members of coetus appear to have been very desirous that Mr. Schwop should be ordained. This appears from a letter *ad interim* addressed to the Fathers in Holland on the 7th of December, 1770, of which the following is an extract:

"The deputies sent to Maryland, Domines Gobrecht and Gros, offer a preliminary report, that Mr. Schwop appears to them in many respects worthy of recommendation, that he manifests extraordinary talents, and that, so far as they can find out, he is innocent of the crimes of injustice and dishonesty charged against him. Concerning the charge of sectarianism, nothing certain could be discovered; but, on the contrary, there are many proofs of his innocence and piety. In the meantime the deputies are of the opinion that the case should be considered, and that preliminary information should be given to your honors, so that we may take no action in such important matters without the wise counsel of the Christian Synods and Classis. We hope by the next meeting of coetus to receive your fatherly advice, and also to give you farther information concerning the condition of Maryland."

We can find no record of the ordination of Mr. Schwop, but it no doubt occurred soon afterwards, as his name appears in subsequent lists of ministers. How the matter was regarded in Holland is sufficiently evident from the following laconic paragraph in a letter from the "Fathers," dated January 12, 1773:

"Concerning the ordination of Domine Schwop we will say nothing, inasmuch as Maryland does not fall under our jurisdiction; but we would earnestly warn you hereafter not to admit men to the ministry unless they have been properly recommended by us."

For several years the minutes of coetus are burdened with accounts of the troubles in Baltimore. To furnish translations of all would be tedious, without adding clearness to the story. Messrs. Gros and Gobrecht congratulated themselves on having restored peace, but the opposition to Mr. Faber broke out almost immediately afterwards with renewed violence. In the Minutes for 1772 we find the following report, which gives a very good account of the progress of affairs up to that date:

"Concerning the congregation in Baltimore, we regret that we cannot report to the Reverend Fathers that it has been reunited, but, on the contrary, its affairs remain in their former condition. Though the coetus has made many efforts and employed all possible means to make peace, these

efforts have hitherto been without avail. The Reverend Fathers will remember, from our proceedings for 1771, that our conclusion concerning Baltimore was to this effect: that Domine Faber and Domine Schwob should both withdraw; that the meeting-house erected by Mr. Schwob should be used for another purpose, and that public worship should be held only in the church. Inasmuch as it was promised by coetus that if this advice was accepted, the first minister sent over by the Reverend Father, should be assigned them, both parties declared themselves satisfied, and were reconciled in the presence of coetus. Domine Faber left Baltimore immediately, and is now pastor at Taneytown; but Domine Schwob continued to preach to his party in the aforesaid meeting-house, which displeased the congregation to such an extent that they began to make inquiries for a minister to preach to them in the church.

It so happened that last winter Domine Wallauer came to this country, but without recommendation from the Reverend Fathers. When the congregation in Baltimore heard of his arrival, they sent a delegate to bring him to that place, and Wallauer accepted the invitation. At the present coetus both parties appeared—the friends of Mr. Schwob as well as those of Mr. Wallauer—and the latter prayed that Mr. Wallauer might be permitted to become their pastor, presenting a call signed by fifty voting members. Inasmuch as we had been warned against Domine Wallauer by the Reverend Fathers, we could not receive him, and this fact was so stated to the delegates from Baltimore.

As neither party would yield, new propositions of union were presented. The first was that the coetus should refuse to consider the affairs of the church of Baltimore unless both congregations should first unite and submit to coetus, which would then make itself responsible to send them a regular teacher. As this proposition was not adopted, the delegates from the congregation were asked whether they would permit Domine Schwob to preach in the church, but they decidedly answered, No! Then it was represented, to Mr. Schwob that, as there were many other places where he might preach—he ought to withdraw from Baltimore, as otherwise union could not be restored. Mr. Schwob replied that he did not insist on remaining from personal motives; but that his party desired that he should continue to preach for them.

Here we have to report that the brethren of coetus are not of one mind in this matter. Some of them on the ground of a resolution adopted at Reading, express the opinion that the parties will never unite until a perfectly impartial minister is sent to them. Others insist that the party of Mr. Schwob should be supported. To these matters the following questions and answers refer, which were decided by a majority of votes, and are herewith presented to the judgment of the Reverend Fathers:

Ques. 1.—When a congregation chooses a pastor who does not belong to

coetus, without the consent or approval of the same, can it be regarded as standing under the care of coetus, and can coetus give its support to such a congregation?

Ans.—No.

Ques. 2.—Can we recognize individual members of such a congregation who submit to coetus and desire to be supplied with a regular pastor?

Ans.—Yes.

It was afterwards resolved that the church in Baltimore shall be visited by those ministers who reside beyond the Susquehanna river.

As the only ministers whose charges were situated in the region referred to in the last clause were Otterbein and Henop, there can be no doubt as to the constitution of the committee of supply.

An attempt at union had been made previous to the arrival of Mr. Wallauer, by extending a call to Rev. Abraham Blumer, Pastor of the Reformed Church, at Allentown, Pennsylvania, but he declined to accept. After one party had irregularly called Mr. Wallauer, the other extended a call to Mr. Otterbein, concerning which call the latter says in the statement in the church-book to which we have already referred: "A call was made to William Otterbein, who then stood in the Reformed Church in York, but he refused, because of the disorganized condition of the congregation; but, after repeated solicitations, he expressed a willingness to accept, provided the coetus should give its consent."\*

Concerning this call, we find the following action in the minutes of the coetus held in Lancaster in 1773:

"Whereas the unfortunate condition of the Baltimore congregation still continues, and one party has extended a call to Domine Otterbein, the inquiry was made, whether it was desirable that Mr. Otterbein should accept the call, and it was resolved, that inasmuch as one party is too greatly prejudiced against Mr. Otterbein, it would be better that some one else should serve the congregation, and if possible seek to reunite it. The elders of both parties then presented a call to Domine Hendel, who received permission from coetus to accept it; and, in case Domine Hendel does not accept, the Baltimore congregation is to have the privilege of calling any other member of coetus."

It should be remembered, in this connection, that, according

\* See Lawrence's "History of the United Brethren in Christ," p. 231.

to an undisputed tradition, Hendel and Otterbein were brothers-in-law, and were certainly very intimate friends. No doubt, the action of coetus was taken with the full approbation of Otterbein, if it was not actually suggested by him. The old church, however, refused to ratify the call extended by its delegates to Dr. Hendel, and the seceding party evidently felt itself justified by the action of coetus in renewing their call to Mr. Otterbein, who finally accepted it. The old church protested against this action, and presented testimonials in favor of Mr. Wallauer; but the coetus referred the whole matter to the Synod in Holland, which was, we take it, a good way of laying it indefinitely on the table. At the coetus of Lebanon, in 1775, Otterbein's call to Baltimore was regularly confirmed, and the coetus expressed its satisfaction at learning that "his labors are blest and the opposing party cease from strife." The importance which Mr. Otterbein attached to this action is evident from the fact that, so late as Jan. 1st, 1785, he transcribed it in full in the statement which he then prepared for the records of his congregation.

In all this it would be hard to find evidences of persecution. On the contrary, it is plain that Otterbein possessed the sympathy of coetus, which persistently refused to recognize Wallauer and his congregation, and gave him a kind word as frequently as possible. That he was what would have been called, in later days, "a new-measure man," may have rendered him unpopular with the opposing party, but it seems to have done him no harm in the coetus, some of whose leading members entertained similar sentiments.

Otterbein organized his congregation as a Reformed church. He called it "Evangelical Reformed," which was in those days a proper title. The congregation fully acknowledged the authority of coetus, and was represented in its meetings. In 1778 and 1780 no meeting of coetus was held, in consequence of the disturbed state of the country, but immediately afterwards Mr. Otterbein was in his place. In 1784 the coetus adopted the following resolution: *Resolved, That, inasmuch as reunion*



is not to be expected (in Baltimore), both congregations be retained and recognized as congregations connected with coetus, so long as they remain faithful to the doctrine and customs of the Reformed Church." The statement, so frequently made, that Otterbein's church was, from the beginning, "practically independent," does not, therefore, appear to be supported by adequate evidence.

In 1771 Francis Asbury, the pioneer of American Methodism, arrived in this country. As is well known, he did not propose to establish a separate religious denomination; but in furtherance of the great movement inaugurated by Wesley and his coadjutors, he founded societies whose sole condition of membership was "a desire to flee the wrath to come and be saved from sin." \* The sacraments were not administered in these Methodist societies, but the class system was introduced, and some of the "leaders" then appointed subsequently became earnest Methodist ministers.

According to Lawrence,† Mr. Asbury became acquainted with Mr. Schwope, and, through him, with Mr. Otterbein, in 1771, the year of his arrival in this country. It is, however, more probable that, as Mr. Otterbein was in Germany during the greater part of that year, the meeting did not occur until 1772, when the latter was appointed by coetus a member of a committee to supply the church at Baltimore. We can well conceive how great must have been the impression made on Otterbein and Schwope by the intimate acquaintance of such a man as Asbury. Their views of religious truth were very similar, and it was natural that they should agree concerning the methods of its promulgation. Wesley's plan of founding societies and holding class-meetings cannot have been new to Mr. Otterbein. It was based on the old idea of the "*ecclesiola in ecclesia*," which had been familiar to the Reformed people of Germany since the days of Jean de Labadie. In many of the churches of the lower Rhine there were societies whose

\* American Cyclopaedia—Art. "*Methodism*."

† "History of the United Brethren in Christ," p. 218.

members regarded themselves as having attained a superior degree of spiritual enlightenment, and who frequently met for mutual edification. In many cases these societies accomplished much good, and as the state was careful to preserve the external organization of the church, it was but rarely that they resulted in schism.

What was more natural than that Otterbein and Schwoppe should conceive the idea of introducing the system advocated by Mr. Asbury, with various modifications, into the German Reformed churches? It seemed to furnish an answer to what was then a burning question, especially in Maryland. The lack of ministers was very great, and the people were everywhere clamoring for religious instruction. In Pennsylvania, under the fostering care of the Synod of Holland, the state of affairs was gradually improving; but in Maryland it was deplorable, and sometimes appeared almost hopeless. The only practicable expedient seemed to be to enlist the laity in the work of the church. Otterbein and Schwoppe accordingly organized class-meetings in their respective churches, and appointed "leaders" who were to aid the pastor in promoting the devotion of the Church and in the exercise of proper discipline. Some of these leaders, we know, were ruling elders in the Church. Semi-annual conferences were held, at which reports were presented from the several societies or classes.

All this appears from the minutes of five of these conferences, which have recently been discovered among the congregational records of St. Benjamin's church, near Westminster, Maryland, which is situated in the region which was in those days known as "Pipe Creek." \* These minutes begin with what appears to have been the second conference, and end abruptly in 1776. It will be observed that during this period the movement was confined to the Reformed church. It in-

\* We are indebted to the Rev. John G. Noss for first directing our attention to these documents, and for completing a copy of them which was begun by the writer of this article.

cluded, we believe, all the Reformed congregations in Maryland, except the First church of Baltimore and Mr. Faber's charge at Taneytown, whose absence it is not necessary to explain. Several churches in Pennsylvania were also represented. The Reformed pastors present, besides Otterbein and Schwope, were Jacob Weimer, of Hagerstown, F. L. Henop, of Frederick, Daniel Wagner, of York, Pa., and William Hendel, of Tulpehocken, Pa. \*

Unfortunately the minutes were written by Mr. Schwope, who was not skilful in using the pen. There is, therefore, much monotony and infelicity of style, which must render these documents uninteresting to the general reader. As, however, they have never been published, and certainly possess considerable historical importance, we venture to present the following translation, which has been made as literal as possible : [1.]

May 29th, 1774. —

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

At our meeting at Pipe Creek the following action was taken respecting our several congregations : Concerning the congregation at Baltimore it was resolved that, besides the public meeting on Sunday, the male members shall meet twice a week in two classes, to wit, the class in the upper part of the city on Tuesday evening, and of this class Leonard Herbach is appointed leader; † the other class, of which Henry Weider is leader, meets on Friday evening; the female members are to meet separately, every Tuesday afternoon.

*Second.* The members at Pipe Creek (*die Peiff-Kricker*) have also formed themselves into two classes; David Schreiber and Michael Hübener are appointed leaders of the first, and Uhly Aeckler and Hans Fischer of the second class. These are to meet every Sunday, and no one is to withdraw without good reason.

*Third.* The members at Sam's Creek (*die Säm's Kricker*) are to constitute a single class. Adam Lehman and Martin Cassel are appointed leaders; they are also to hold their meetings on Sunday.

*Fourth.* The members at Fredericktown (*die Friedrichstowner*) have

\* We have examined the signatures of these ministers, as attached to the minutes of the meeting held in Oct. 1774, and can vouch for their authenticity.

† The German word is *Aufscher*, which might be more literally rendered "superintendent" or "overseer."

organized but one class; they are to meet on Sunday evening, and propose to elect a leader for themselves.

*Fifth.* The members at Antietam (*die Antietamer*) are to meet every Sunday, in two classes. George Adam Gueding and Samuel Becker are appointed leaders. They are to meet alternately at the church and at Conrad Schnäbeli's, or wherever else the leaders may direct.

The ground and object of these meetings is to be, that those thus united may encourage each other, pray and sing in unison, and watch over each other's conduct. At these meetings they are to be especially careful to see to it that family worship is regularly maintained; all those who are thus united are to take heed that no disturbances occur among them, and that the affairs of the congregations be conducted and managed in an orderly manner.

Resolved to meet again on the first Sunday in October at D. Schreiber's. Done on the date above mentioned.

W. OTTERBEIN.

[2.]

B. SWOPE.

October 2, 1776.

In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.

At our meeting at David Schreibers, at Pipe Creek, the following action was taken concerning our several congregations:

*First.* In the previously mentioned congregations everything remains as at first arranged without any change.

*Second.* Several friends in Canawaken\* have agreed to hold meetings, but no leader has yet been appointed. They are to meet every Sunday, and it is determined that they shall be visited from time to time by one of the undersigned ministers.

*Third.* The friends in Sharpsburg have formed a union (*haben sich vereinigt*). Mr. Stein (?), the schoolmaster, is appointed their leader. Further arrangements are to be made at the earliest opportunity by Benedict Schwob and Mr. Weimer.

*Fourth.* The friends in Funkstown and Hagerstown are to be visited and organized (like the above congregations) by the aforesaid ministers.

*Fifth.* Resolved to meet next year in Frederick, on the first Sunday after Pentecost.

Done on the date aforesaid.

W. OTTERBEIN.

W. HENDEL.

JACOB WEIMER.

FRIEDERICH LUD. HENOP.

DANIEL WAGNER.

BENEDICT SWOPE.

\* Conewago, i. e., Christ church, Adams co., Pa.

[3.] Fredericktown, June 12, 1775.

In the name of our blessed Lord. Amen :

We, William Otterbein, William Hendel, Frederick Henop, Jacob Weimer, Daniel Wagner, and Benedict Swope, have met in this town, according to the resolution passed at our meeting held last October at Pipe Creek, and after due examination the following was found to be the condition of the congregations or classes :

*First.* The friends in this town are at peace, and continue their private meetings twice a week, besides regularly attending the service in the church.

*Second.* The friends at Pipe Creek are equally prosperous, appear serious in their conduct, and, it is hoped, derive a blessing from their meetings.

*Third.* Those at Sam's Creek are at peace and appear serious.

*Fourth.* Those at Antietam are again at peace, after a slight disturbance, and meet on Sundays.

*Fifth.* Those at Baltimore are at peace ; but it is to be feared and guarded against, that with their good order and regular meetings, they do not take the appearance for the reality.

*Sixth.* Those at Sharpsburg remain in their previous condition. They hold meetings. There is no reason to imagine evil, but it might be wished that their condition was more prosperous.

*Seventh.* Those at Funkstown number only a few families, and as they live close together, they meet according to their convenience. At this place progress is very desirable.

*Eighth.* The friends at Canawaken (who were mentioned at our last meeting at Pipe Creek) continue to meet on Sunday, besides going regularly to church, as is our universal order. We have reason to hope for good results.

*Ninth.* Certain friends in Hagerstown were interested, but none of them have come to our present meeting. We hope the Lord will kindle among them a flame of love and holy zeal.

*Tenth.* Resolved, that our next meeting be held at Baltimore, on Sunday, Oct. 15th.

*Finally.* We observe that since our first meeting, which is now more than a year ago, no disturbance has arisen in any one of the aforesaid classes and congregations (except a little trouble at Antietam, which has been covered up with the mantle of charity). In this may be seen the fruits of good discipline, in that at least three hundred souls have remained so long at peace, and we hope in the blessing of the Lord, and may doubtless be preserved in this condition. We hope and desire that the Lord, the merciful, would daily add to their numbers.

Written and done on the date aforesaid, by order of the United Ministers,  
by

BENEDICT SCHWOB, *Secretary.*

[4.]

Baltimore town, October 15th, 1775.

In Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

We, William Otterbein, William Hendel, Frederick Lud. Henop, Daniel Waggoner, and Benedict Schwob have met again, in this town, in accordance with the resolution adopted at our last meeting, in Fredericktown, on the 12th of June last.

*First.* The friends in this town are at peace; they observe the former regulations, and there is no change.

*Second.* The friends in Frederick continue in their former state of prosperity; so also the class at P. Kemp's (?). Both have increased in numbers.

*Third.* The friends at Sam's Creek continue at peace as previously. Friend Conrad Dotterer has been appointed leader instead of Martin Casel who lives too far away.

*Fourth.* The friends at Antietam are at peace, and hold meetings according to our rules.

*Fifth.* Those at Sharpsburg are at peace, and conduct themselves in accordance with the general rules of their meetings. It is well. Hopes of increase.

*Sixth.* Those at Funkstown are at peace and meet weekly.

*Seventh.* Those at Hagerstown are at peace and meet every Sunday.

*Eighth.* The friends at Canawaken meet every Sunday and are at peace.

*Ninth.* The friends at Great Pipe Creek\* are thus far at peace, (some troubles in the Stein family excepted).

*Tenth.* The friends at Little Pipe Creek† are in perfect peace, and we trust enjoy a blessing. Both classes at the Pipe Creeks meet every Sunday and still have their first leaders.

*Eleventh.* Several friends in Germantown‡ have made application, and are to be served.

*Twelfth.* Resolved, That our next meeting be held in Hagerstown on the first Sunday after Pentecost.

BENEDICT SCHWOB, *Scriba.*

[5.]

June 2d, 1776, John Ranger's.

In Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

We, William Otterbein, William Händel, Daniel Wagener, Jacob Weimert, and Benedict Schwob, have held another meeting, according to the resolution adopted at our last meeting, held at Baltimore, on the 15th of October last.

\* St. Mary's Church, Silver Run, Maryland.

† St. Benjamin's Church near Westminster.

‡ Manchester, Maryland, was formerly called Germantown.

*First.* The friends in Baltimore are prosperous and meet as formerly. The congregation has, however, been considerably weakened by disturbances caused by the war.

*Second.* The friends in Fredericktown are prosperous and at peace, and have increased in numbers. The class at P. Kemp's (?) is not so prosperous. Steiner and Studel leaders.

*Third.* The friends at Sam's Creek are prosperous.

*Fourth.* The friends at the Antietam continue at peace and are prosperous.

*Fifth.* The friends in Sharpsburg were for some time careless, but have now become more active.

*Sixth.* Those at Funkstown and Hagerstown have united. (George Arnold leader).

*Seventh.* Those at Canawaken are prosperous and serious.

*Eighth.* Those at Great Pipe Creek are prosperous and at peace. Leaders, Jost Maurer and Jacob Cassel.

*Ninth.* Those at Little Pipe Creek are prosperous.

*Tenth.* Beaver Dam. The friends are united and meet every Sunday. \*

*Eleventh.* At Peter Reitenauer's the friends meet every Sunday. Peter Reitenauer leader.

*Twelfth.* Germantown is to be further supplied.

*Thirteenth.* On Sunday, October 20th, we will meet again in Canawaken, at Jacob Wilt's.]

BENEDICT SCHWOB, *Scriba.*

Here the record abruptly ends, and we do not know if the meeting at Jacob Wilt's was ever held. As Mr. Schwobe's name does not appear in the minutes of the coetus after this date, we are inclined to believe that he died about this time.\* If the minutes of subsequent meetings were kept, they must have been recorded elsewhere. There are, so far as we know, no extant documents, bearing on the progress of this religious movement, between 1776 and 1789.

It appears more than probable that soon after the former date peculiarities of doctrine and worship began to appear which

\* In the accounts of the earliest recognized conferences of the "United Brethren," held in 1789 and 1791, as given by Lawrence, Schwobe is mentioned among the absentees. If these statements are based on cotemporary documents they indicate that he was then still living; but, if so, it is strange that he should not have been present on these occasions.

greatly affected the character of the "unity." The conferences instituted by the "united ministers" soon became "great meetings" of the type with which we are familiar from the early history of Methodism. Among those who became most profoundly interested were men who were not connected with the Reformed Church, and who had no intention of becoming identified with it. It was evident that a new type of church life was in process of development, and most of the ministers and members of the Reformed Church therefore gradually withdrew from the organization. This process was no doubt facilitated by the fact that during the latter part of the Revolution the meetings were interrupted by the disturbed state of the country.

Otterbein evidently regarded the subject in a somewhat different light. Like Zinzendorf, when he founded the "Congregation of God in the Spirit," he seems to have imagined that Christians of various denominations might participate in a higher unity without renouncing their original ecclesiastical relations. He, therefore, continued to take interest in the movement which he had helped to inaugurate, but at the same time was careful to remain in regular standing in the coetus of the Reformed Church. He also remained favorable to the Methodists, and in 1784 assisted Dr. Coke in the ordination of Mr. Asbury. In the same year he was present at the coetus held at Lancaster, Pa., and in 1785 was excused on account of a missionary journey which he had undertaken to the vacant churches of Virginia. These facts enable us to form an idea of the peculiar position occupied by Mr. Otterbein.

The relations of the two Reformed churches at Baltimore appear to have gradually become more pleasant. In 1779 Mr. Wallauer resigned, and under a succession of faithful pastors the First Church, which had previously been regarded as schismatic, became thoroughly attached to the Church, as it has continued to be down to the present day. When this congregation proceeded to erect a new church, in 1796, Mr. Otterbein preached both at the laying of the corner-stone and at the



consecration. This shows that by this time the discussions between the congregations must have in great measure subsided. In 1797 the Reformed ministers of Baltimore were both present at the meeting of coetus held in York, Pa., and it was then officially declared that "peace and harmony prevailed in all the congregations." It does not appear that Mr. Otterbein's church in Baltimore increased very rapidly, for in 1791 he reported to coetus that the church numbered sixty members, and that during the year he had baptized twenty-four and confirmed twelve persons. We take it for granted that he spent much time in itinerant labors, and that his congregation was accordingly less prosperous than it might otherwise have been.

There is a tradition that at a great meeting held in the barn of Isaac Long, in Lancaster county, Otterbein met for the first time Martin Boehm, who had hitherto labored principally among the Mennonites. Boehm, it is said, preached with such eloquence that Otterbein embraced him before he took his seat, and exclaimed: "We are Brethren!" From this expression the name "United Brethren" is said to be derived.

We have no reason to question the historic occurrence of this dramatic event. The two men must have been brought together in some way, or they would not have so cordially co-operated at the "first regular" conference of the "United Brethren" in 1789. To embrace a fellow-laborer under such circumstances was, of course, much more natural to a demonstrative German than it would be to an American of the present generation, but we venture to suggest that there is a great difference between fraternal recognition and organic union. If the former only was involved this famous meeting may have occurred at an early date, but if it is held to mark the beginning of practical co-operation, it must, we think, have occurred after the withdrawal of the Reformed ministers, as Boehm's name does not appear in the minutes of their meetings. It is from Boehm, and several of his associates who were also of Mennonite extraction, that the denominational peculiarities of the "United Brethren" are held to be principally derived.

Among the class-leaders appointed in 1774 appears the name of George Adam Gueting, of Antietam. He was we believe the only one of the "leaders" who subsequently became an ordained minister. As he exerted an influence on the movement under consideration not inferior to that of Otterbein or Boehm, a brief sketch of his career may not be inappropriate.

GEORGE ADAM GUETING (born 1741; died 1812,) was a native of Nassau, Germany, who had emigrated to America in his eighteenth year. Though not an educated man he was by no means ignorant, and when Otterbein met him he was teaching school somewhere on the Antietam. After his appointment as class-leader he at first read sermons to the people, but subsequently developed extraordinary talent as an *ex tempore* speaker. Otterbein became his warm personal friend, and probably instructed him in Theology. The date of his ordination we have not been able to ascertain, but the act was performed by Hendel and Otterbein, under the direction of coetus.\* He was present, with Otterbein, at the meeting of coetus held in Lancaster in 1791, and then affixed his signature to the minutes. It seems, however, that his heart was not in the Reformed Church. He was an enthusiast of the most pronounced type, whose preaching was attended by the extraordinary excitement so characteristic of earlier days. Under his auspices were chiefly held the "great meetings" on the Antietam, which are not yet entirely forgotten. In this respect, we believe, he went further than Mr. Otterbein, whose disposition was more quiet and reflective.

Mr. Gueting was present at Synod in 1794 and 1797, but subsequently sent excuses. In 1798 Mr. Hinsch complained that he "was making encroachments on his congregations," and it was resolved "that Mr. Gueting should be written to in reference to this matter." In 1802, when Mr. Gueting's usual excuse for absence was presented, it was resolved, that "a friendly and brotherly letter be written to him, and that he therein be urged by all means to attend the next annual meet-

\* Lawrence, I., p. 182,

ing of Synod." He failed to respond to this invitation, and in 1804 complaints were preferred against him for disorderly conduct. Finally, he was excluded from Synod by a vote of twenty to seventeen. A note was however added to this action, stating that he might "at any time be restored on giving evidence of true reformation."

This is the entire action of the Reformed Synod in the case of Mr. Gueting, which has so frequently been represented as a series of persecutions. It is difficult to see how, with proper self-respect, the Synod could have acted otherwise, and we can hardly resist the conclusion that Gueting expected this action and did not desire it to be different. He continued to labor in the way which pleased him best, and his memory is greatly cherished in the church of the "United Brethren."

Otterbein attended but a single conference of the "Brethren" after the exclusion of Gueting from the Reformed Synod. This was in 1805, after which date, it is said, he withdrew from the active work. It is true that he was advanced in years, but as he continued in charge of his congregation until his death, which occurred in 1813, eight years later, this suggestion as to the cause of his absence is not entirely satisfactory. Is it not at least possible that after the Synod had spoken in the case of Gueting, he felt that he could no longer attend these conferences without placing himself in a position of antagonism to the body to which he owed his first allegiance? There can, however, be no doubt that he was warmly attached to the men with whom he had labored, and that the latter to the end regarded him with unlimited veneration. Popularly the "Brethren" were still known as "New Reformed"; but Otterbein must have foreseen that a new denomination was unavoidable, and one of his last official acts was to assist in giving it a settled ministry by the rite of ordination. Thus he sent it forth with his benediction, but preferred to remain in the church of his fathers. It will be remembered that J. D. Aurand, Henry Hiestand, Thomas Winters, and

perhaps others, who had participated in the early conferences, also finally determined to remain in the Reformed church, of which they became worthy and efficient ministers. Winters says in his autobiography: "During this time" (between 1809 and 1815) "I was strongly urged to go into the organization of a new church, called the 'United Brethren of Christ, which was then in process of formation, and which did actually come into being; but like the great Otterbein whom I greatly loved and esteemed for his piety and talents, I preferred rather to live and die in the Reformed church."

There can be no doubt that Mr. Otterbein continued a regular member of the Reformed Synod until the end of his life. He attended its meeting held in Baltimore in 1806, one year after he was present for the last time at a conference of the "Brethren," and his name was always retained on the roll of its members. In August, 1812, he said to the Rev. Isaac Gerhart: "I too am a member of the Synod of the German Reformed church; but cannot attend on account of old age." \* He was at that time eighty-six years old.

It would be useless to reiterate the testimony of the younger Dr. Hendel, and others, on this subject, as it has been given in full by Dr. Harbaugh. We may add that a part, at least, of Otterbein's correspondence with Rev. J. H. Fries has been preserved, and that a letter inviting Fries to preach in his church in Baltimore is at present in the possession of the writer of this article.† In brief, according to the unanimous testimony of aged ministers who were his cotemporaries—with some of whom the writer enjoyed the privilege of conversing, many years ago—the standing of Mr. Otterbein, as a regular member of the Reformed Synod, was, during his life-time never called into question. His congregation was, however, so thoroughly permeated by the spirit of the movement in which its pastor had at one time been actively engaged, that after his death it became possible to alienate it from the church to which it rightfully belonged.

\* Harbaugh's "Lives of the Fathers," II, p. 69.

† *Ibid*, p. 68.

With reference to the personal excellence of Mr. Otterbein there can be no difference of opinion. Even those who differed from him with respect to the methods which he pursued were impressed by his unaffected piety and attracted by his benevolent disposition. We have however formed the conclusion that his doctrinal views were somewhat vague, and that he failed to appreciate the full importance of ecclesiastical organization and order.

Our chief object has been to place on record certain documents which cast a new light on an interesting religious movement. It has thus been incidentally shown that at least in its earlier stages, Mr. Otterbein was more completely in accord with his church than has been generally supposed, enjoying the full co-operation of several of its leading ministers. That he occasionally encountered opposition is not unlikely, but we cannot find a trace of persecution. On the contrary it is evident that he was treated by the Synod with the utmost kindness and consideration, and that to the end of his life he remained in full communion with the Reformed Church.

## V.

### THE PULPIT: ITS PROVINCE AND ITS POWER.

BY REV. JOHN M. TITZEL, D.D.

It has been not unfrequently very positively asserted of late years that the pulpit is losing its power over the minds and hearts of men, and that in consequence the services of the church are being more and more neglected. Various reasons are assigned for this being the case. Some maintain that it is to be accounted for on the ground that Christianity itself is becoming effete. Others claim that it is owing to the growing intelligence of the people and to the increasing power of the press which they tell us is more effectually enlightening the masses than the pulpit is, and therefore taking its place. Still others find the explanation of the supposed fact in the deficiencies of the pulpit itself, and especially in what they believe to be its failure to meet properly the demands of the present age. Thus the Hon. W. H. Freemantle in the Essay prefatory to his volume entitled "The Secular Gospel," after stating that the leaders of science or art or politics are apt to hold an ambiguous position to the church, and that the attitude of the best minds toward the Christian system generally is often that of hesitancy, assigns as a reason for this, that "the decisive and directing power over men's consciences is not felt to lie within the church's sphere, so that, as has been recently said, the great secular influences form new religions;" and further adds, that "that which is needed, and for lack of which Christianity languishes, is a wider outlook, a determination to look the world in the face without a misgiving or mistrust, to spiritualize and to harmonize, to foster and to inspire, the various spheres and in-

terests which the Providence of God opens to the men of our day." In view of these various assertions the questions naturally arise, What is the true province of the pulpit? and, Is it really the case that the power of the pulpit is waning? Both these questions, it is scarcely necessary to say, are important and deserve the thoughtful consideration of all who have at heart the interests of Christianity.

In the Essay already referred to, the Hon. W. H. Freemantle says: "Christians should be interested in and should foster all that is excellent in science or art or political life as that which is their proper business. They should seek first to infuse the spirit of Christ into these spheres wherever they have been perverted to selfishness; and next, to include them within the recognized scope of the Christian church." In this he is undoubtedly correct. All these things unquestionably pertain to man as man. They are not the products of sin, though, like everything else pertaining to man, perverted by sin and often used for sinful purposes. As truly belonging to man, they come properly within the range of the sanctifying influence of the salvation purchased by the blood of Christ. For we are expressly told in the Gospel of St. John that "God sent not his Son into the world, to condemn the world; but that the world through Him might be saved" (John 3: 17). Christ according to the same Gospel, moreover, declared Himself to be "the light of the world" (John 8: 12); and St. Paul in his Epistle to the Colossians says: "By Him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist; and He is the head of the body the Church; who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead; that in all things He might have the pre-eminence" (Col. 1: 16-18). In view of what is thus taught, it is very evident that nothing that forms a true part of man's life can be properly foreign to Christianity. Christ was born, and lived, and died, and rose again to save man in the totality of his being,

and, therefore to deliver from the bondage of sin and to sanctify every department of human life. Hence, as St. Paul assures us, "Godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come." (1 Tim. 4: 8).

But it does not follow from this that it pertains to the province of the pulpit to teach philosophy or science or art or politics as such. For doing this from the pulpit there is no warrant in the teachings of God's Word. Not in this way has Christianity to do with these things. In the Gospels Christ is not presented to us as a philosopher or a scientist, an artist or a politician. He taught nothing directly about any of these departments of human activity. His mission was not to expound the laws of human intelligence or of the material universe, or to discuss the principles of art or of civil government. His was a far higher and grander work. He came into the world to declare and establish the righteousness of God, and to reveal fully unto men the Fatherhood and boundless love of God, in order that in His own person He might bring man back again to God, the only true source of life and light. This was His mission and to this mission He consecrated His whole life, being obedient unto death, even the death of the cross. "Wherefore," St. Paul informs us, "God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2: 9-11).

Had Christ labored as a philosopher or scientist or statesman, He would have dealt only with the things pertaining to the periphery of man's life, and no matter how great His achievements might have been, they would have been only of a temporal character, and sooner or later would have been swept away by the flood of evil flowing from the perverted and corrupt centre of man's life. But laboring as He did, He dealt with that which is central in man, and in restoring man to his true



centre He accomplished a work which could not but regenerate every sphere of human existence and be of enduring, yea, eternal significance. For it is a very important truth which men are apt practically to overlook and ignore, that evil of every sort has its source in the false relation which man in his fallen condition sustains to God, and that it is only as man is brought into right relation to God, that any form of evil can be thoroughly overcome and eradicated. Yet notwithstanding this is continually forgotten by men, it is nevertheless the case. Every sin when traced to its ultimate source will be found to have its origin in unbelief which either denies the existence of God, or His intervention in the affairs of men, or else mistrusts His wisdom and goodness. Did men always truly believe in the existence of God and in the reality of His power, wisdom, justice and goodness, they would never willingly engage in sin, or for a moment consciously delight therein. And just because sin has its origin in unbelief there can be no sure and effectual remedy for it, save in that faith which lies at the basis of a right relation to God. Such faith, moreover, cannot fail to sanctify all the spheres and relations of life. He that possesses it will necessarily be influenced by it in all his actions, and so do all he does to the glory of God. In other words, he will constantly be induced to seek earnestly to know what is the will of God as regards his work, and to strive faithfully to do it in harmony with this will. Whatever he does will therefore tend to be excellently done, because done in accordance with the principles of the absolutely true and beautiful and good. Furthermore, as faith in God is most intimately associated not only with love to God but likewise with love to man, it tends also to unite men more and more in the bonds of a true brotherhood, and to lead them to foster and delight in all that is excellent in the pursuits and labors of each other. In this way Christianity has to do most really with all the occupations and relations of mankind.

As regards more especially the true province of the pulpit, this according to the teachings of the Scriptures we hold to be

no more nor less than to proclaim to men Christ as the only Saviour, and to persuade them to accept Him as such by faithfully expounding and enforcing the truths of God's word as contained in the Old and in the New Testament, and by bearing personal testimony to His power to save. This is what Jesus commanded His immediate disciples to do. After His triumphant resurrection from the dead, and just before His glorious ascension to the right hand of God the Father Almighty, He directly commissioned them to go and preach the Gospel to every creature (Mark 16 : 15) and to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded (Matt. 28 : 20); and expressly declared to them that they should be witnesses unto Him both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth (Acts 1 : 8). And in accordance with these instructions, we are further informed, they very strictly acted. In their discourses as reported in the Acts of the Apostles, as well as in their Epistles that have come down to us, we find no philosophical or scientific, or political discussions whatever, but we do find them abounding in expositions of the Scriptures and of the teachings of Jesus and of direct and emphatic personal testimony to Jesus as the Christ of God who is able to save to the uttermost all those who come unto Him. This fact we deem especially note-worthy. When we think of the stirring political events that were constantly occurring during the period, in which the New Testament Scriptures were written, it is almost marvellous that no special mention of any of them was made. But this, we think, clearly shows that the Apostles did not consider it part of their work to discuss, or to call attention in their spiritual ministrations to these things. In their instructions they all like St. Paul, determined not to know anything among those whom they addressed, save Christ and Him crucified (1 Cor. 2 : 12). To them Christ was all in all, and so should He ever be to His ministers. For if He is not all in all to them, He will soon be nothing to them but a name.

But not only is the preaching of Christ in the way indicated

the proper work of the pulpit ; but in thus preaching Him consists its true power and glory. The history of preaching clearly proves this to be the case. The most powerful and successful preachers in every period of the Christian era, and in every section of the Christian church, have ever been those who confined themselves most closely in their pulpit ministrations to the exposition of the Scriptures as bearing witness of Christ as the only hope of a perishing world. And the reason of this is neither difficult to discover, nor hard to understand. The deepest need of humanity is, undoubtedly, the need of a Saviour. There is in men universally a consciousness of sin and guilt, and, consequently, of exposure to the wrath of the Almighty Creator and Governor of the universe ; and of the need of some one to deliver them from this wrath, in order to their present well-being and final happiness. All human history and all human experience testify to the existence of this consciousness. So also do they testify that the only person who really possesses all the necessary requisites of a Saviour is Jesus Christ. When properly brought before men, therefore, He never fails to commend Himself to those who truly long for redemption, and to regenerate, sanctify and glorify those who in faith receive Him and keep His words. The contents of the Scriptures, all of which centre in Christ, and the expounding of which is necessary to the proper setting forth of Christ, have, indeed, to do so directly with the deepest needs and profoundest questionings of the human heart, and so admirably supply these needs and answer these questionings, that it is really impossible to conceive of a greater or more inspiring mission than that of proclaiming them. We need but carefully consider the subjects of which they treat to be assured of their superior excellency. St. Augustine well said, "Thou, God, hast created us for Thyself and our hearts are without rest, until they rest in Thee." "The knowledge of God is not only the highest, but also the most desirable knowledge." Now in the contents of the Scriptures God is revealed unto us. They tell us what He is, and what is our relation to Him. They inform us of the origin of the world

and of our own existence. They teach us what are the duties we owe to God, to our fellow-men and to ourselves. They make known to us how we became estranged from God and miserable, and point out the way back to God and to the enjoyment of heavenly blessedness and glory. Surely there can be no profounder truths than these, none more important for man to know. For they are truths not merely of temporal, but of eternal significance: truths whose contents are inexhaustible and of perennial interest, and of which the more we know, the more we find there is still to be learned. It is not without reason, therefore, that the true power and glory of the pulpit have ever consisted in the proclaiming and expounding of these truths.

When instead of preaching Christ and expounding the Scriptures the pulpit gives itself to discoursing about the current events of the day, and to the discussion of political, philosophical and scientific questions, it always forsakes its true province and exposes itself to the loss of power. And it does so, not only because in dealing with these things, it deals with the temporal and transient, but also because it is especially liable to make great mistakes in those questions which do not properly pertain to it, which mistakes will be sure to be discovered sooner or later, and when discovered will tend to discredit its teachings on all subjects—even on those regarding which they are deserving of acceptance and should be authoritative. No man can reasonably expect to be a master in all things; and skill in one department of labor is never a guarantee of skill in another. A Doctor of Divinity is not necessarily a Doctor of Medicine, and should be set up for such, without first thoroughly studying medicine, he would be sure to prove a quack. Equally liable is he to prove a charlatan in other matters that do not properly pertain to his province. The wise and faithful minister of the Lord Jesus Christ will therefore always confine himself in his pulpit ministrations to proclaiming and enforcing the great spiritual truths and moral principles inculcated in the word of God, and leave it to Scientists to settle scientific questions, and to statesmen to discuss and decide matters pertaining purely to

the state. And though, like St. Paul, he will not shrink from declaring to men the whole counsel of God, he will yet, nevertheless, also take care not to make the pulpit a mere censorship of morals, but rather the inspirer of holy living—a beacon light to guide perishing, sin-sick souls, tossed on life's tempestuous sea, into the haven of eternal life and blessedness.

From what has now been said as regards the province of the pulpit, it is not to be inferred, however, that the minister of Christ should be only acquainted with the contents of the Sacred Scriptures and thoroughly informed as to the doctrines therein contained. He needs indeed to know God's word, that he may proclaim it, but he needs also to be acquainted with the various thoughts and feelings of men, in order that he may know how to address to them the message of God in the most acceptable manner. The broader his culture therefore, the better will he be fitted for his work. The more thoroughly he is versed in philosophy, science, art, literature and politics, the better will he be prepared to lead those engaged in these pursuits to a knowledge of the truth as the truth is in Jesus. Among the Apostles of our blessed Lord, St. Paul was unquestionably the most cultured; and to this, no doubt, is due the fact that he was enabled to labor more abundantly than they all. It was his thorough acquaintance with the manners, customs and thoughts of both Jew and Gentile, that especially made it possible for him to become all things to all men in order that he might win some to Christ. It is important that this fact should not be overlooked by those who would be ambassadors for Christ to beseech men on behalf of Christ to be reconciled to God. To such, if possible, nothing that pertains to human life, excepting what is in itself evil, should be foreign. An ignorant ministry can never be a truly successful ministry, but will certainly sooner or later through its gross mistakes fall into contempt. Those churches therefore act wisely that do all they can to educate thoroughly in all the principal departments of knowledge, those whom they expect to call to minister to them in holy things.

Above all, however, should those who preach Christ truly know Christ themselves. Without a spiritual knowledge of Him no matter how thorough their culture in the things of this world may be, they can never bear convincing testimony to Jesus as the Saviour from sin and death, and to the Holy Ghost whom He has sent, as the Lord, the Giver of life. For no man can speak authoritatively of that which he knows only by hearsay. Yet he that would truly move those whom he addresses, and carry conviction home to their hearts, must speak with authority. He must bear witness not only to what others have said, but to what he knows from his own personal experience. The love of Christ must ever constrain him who would successfully win others to Christ. Heart must speak to heart, or else they will most likely prove but empty words that pass from the preacher to the people who wait upon his ministry. Moreover, to him who is ignorant of Christ's saving power, the Sacred Scriptures must ever remain, to a great extent, a sealed book. With their outer contents he may indeed become well acquainted, but of their inner truths, in which their true value and glory consist, he can have no real knowledge. These latter will necessarily remain hidden from him. For "the natural man," St. Paul assures us, "receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2: 14). Such an one can, therefore, never be a trustworthy expounder of the Sacred Scriptures to his fellow-men. He may speak to them "in the words which man's wisdom teacheth"—but not, as St. Paul, in those "which the Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual" (1 Cor. 2: 13). An unspiritual and worldly-minded ministry, accordingly, can never be a truly successful one; and where it exists, the pulpit will necessarily exert but little influence for good, and lose the respect of men on account of its hollowness. On the other hand, however, where there is true spirituality and love for Christ on the part of the ministry, and especially where this is joined to a broad culture, the pulpit can never fail to be mighty

through God in the way of "casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" (2 Cor. 2: 10).

But notwithstanding all that has now been asserted, the question may nevertheless arise, Is not the power of the pulpit really waning? To this question we feel assured that we are warranted by the facts in the case to give a decidedly negative answer. For while it may be true that in some places there has been a falling away from the Church, and that in still other places there is a growing indifference to the preaching of the word of God, yet when we survey the state of things throughout the whole world we have no reason whatever to believe that Christianity is becoming effete, or that the pulpit is exerting less power now in the way of advancing the cause of our Lord Jesus Christ than it did in times that are past. On the contrary, there never was a period in the past history of the world when Christianity was so widely diffused among men as it is now. The followers of Christ have virtually encompassed the earth. There is scarcely a land on the face of the globe any longer where the glad tidings of salvation are not proclaimed to men. Everywhere in heathen lands the work of Missions is going bravely on, and throughout Asia, Africa and the islands of the sea large numbers are steadily being won to Christ. Some there are, indeed, who deny all this, and boldly assert that missions are a failure, and that in all Christian lands believers are rapidly decreasing, but trustworthy statistics, as has lately been very conclusively shown, prove the utter groundlessness of their assertions. Many there are, we freely admit, in all churches, who have a name to live but are dead, but so it was already in the Apostolic times, and there is reason to believe that, proportionally, there are no more such now, than perhaps, with rare exceptions, there ever have been, so that no argument can be properly drawn from this fact that Christianity is becoming obsolescent. As in ages past, so still the Gospel of Christ "is the power of God unto salvation to



every one that believeth" (Rom. i. 16); and so it will continue to be until "the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of His Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever" (Rev. xi. 15).

There is no reason therefore for despairing of Christianity. It is no waning faith and never will be. Neither is there any danger of the pulpit ever being supplanted by the press. Great as is the power of the latter, it can never take the place of the former. That the press has been, and still is, a great help in furthering the cause of the Lord, there can be no question. By multiplying Bibles and religious books of all kinds and placing them within the reach of the people, it has done a great and glorious work in the way of enlightening them on the subject of religion. But men need not only to be enlightened as to what is their duty but also to be inspired to do it. A book may inform, but it is the personal appeal, that as a rule, moves to action. It is when a man speaks face to face with men that he is best able to fill them with his own spirit, and incite them to deeds of noble daring, or to holy living. The pleading voice, the flashing eyes, the beaming countenance, the appropriate gestures of the speaker, add potency to thought and make it far more real and impressive than it is upon the printed page. Hence the pulpit must ever be mightier than the press as a means of awakening men to a realizing sense of their lost and perishing condition and of their need of a Saviour, and of leading them to the cross of Christ as the only refuge of safety, the only fountain of life and peace. If anywhere, therefore, the true power of the pulpit is waning, it cannot be due to the taking of its place by newspapers and books, as is sometimes asserted, but must be owing to some other cause. But in reality the true power of the pulpit is not waning. This is evident from the fact already noticed, that Christianity is being more widely diffused than ever, and is exerting a greater influence on the lives of men than at any previous period in the world's history. Outside of its proper province it is, perhaps, true that the pulpit no longer exerts as much direct



influence in the affairs of men as it did when nearly all the learning of the world was monopolized by the ministry, and church and state throughout Christendom were united; but in its own proper province there is reason to believe that it has been a gainer by this loss, and will continue to be a gainer. For there can be no doubt that it is always better that truth should be accepted for its own sake, than that it should be accepted merely as a means to secure something else, as it is apt to be when those who teach it have power to confer temporal benefits on those who profess to follow their instructions; since in reality truth received for any other purpose than itself, is not truly received at all, and can exert no real saving and sanctifying power on the life.

In view of the facts to which attention has now been directed, it is very evident that the assertions to which reference was made at the beginning of this article have no proper ground in the actual state of things, and are rather phantoms of the imagination than sober facts. Christianity is not losing its hold on the hearts and minds of men. The pulpit is not a rapidly waning power. On the contrary, as of old, it continues to offer the grandest and most truly exalted field of labor to those who are willing to consecrate their lives to the service of God and the best interests of their fellow-men. Neither does it need even materially to change its methods of teaching to adapt itself to the wants of the present age. The old truths of God's Word are still best suited to the needs of man, and the simple story of the cross is still unsurpassed in its power to subdue the rebellious heart of man, and to regenerate and sanctify his whole life. The earnest and faithful preacher of the Gospel is just as sure of a fitting audience now as he ever was. In asserting this, we would not be understood to maintain that the Christianity of our times is all that it should be, or that the pulpit is exerting all the power that God designed it to exert over the lives of men. Undoubtedly, there is a great deal of lukewarmness among those who profess to be followers of Christ; and ministers generally are not near so earnest and faithful in preaching

Christ and expounding the Scriptures as they should be. Both among the laity and the ministry there is abundant room for improvement. But while this is so, there is, nevertheless, no reason why Christians should feel discouraged, or young men hesitate to enter upon the work of the ministry. The cry that faith in Christ is dying out is only one of the tricks of the prince of darkness, to lead men to believe that the gates of hades are prevailing against the Church of Christ, in order that he may induce them to worship the lord of hades. He that is wise will not permit himself thereby to be deceived.

---

## VI.

## NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

**THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF THEISM:** An Examination of the Personality of Man to ascertain his capacity to know and serve God, and the validity of the principles underlying the defense of Theism. By Samuel Harris, D.D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological Department of Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

This volume, the author informs us in the preface, has grown out of lectures and discussions in the class-room, and is given to the public with the hope that it may be of service to those who are striving to solve the great theological and religious problems of our times. From the Introductory chapter we learn, that it "is not designed to present in detail the evidence of the existence of God; it is designed to examine the constitution of man as a personal being in order to ascertain his capacity to know and serve God, to answer the philosophical questions involved in the controversy with skepticism, agnosticism and materialism, and indicate the principles on which the defense of theism must rest. It is not intended to be a treatise on psychology, ethics or metaphysics."

The work consists of eighteen chapters. Among the subjects considered are the following: Knowledge and Agnosticism, The Acts and Processes of Knowing, The Ultimate Realities of Human Knowledge, The Sensibilities, The Will, Personality, Materialistic Objections to the Existence of Personal Beings, and The Two Systems of Nature and Personality. All these subjects are discussed with marked ability. In their treatment Dr. Harris

shows himself to be thoroughly acquainted with the leading tendencies of philosophical thinking both in England and in Germany, and also with the various scientific theories that are now claiming the attention of men. In psychology, ethics, and the philosophy of religion, he appears perfectly at home. In a literary point of view he also excels in these discussions which are anything else than dry reading.

In the introductory chapter of his book Dr. Harris gives his readers to understand, that, in his view, "reason is the person considered as illuminated with reason, and will is the person considered as determining and energizing, and sensibility the person considered as the subject of motives and emotions; that will is reason determining and energizing, and reason is will rational." Those Theologians "who do not recognize God as the Supreme Reason, but exalt Will to supremacy, teaching that the distinction of right and wrong results from a fiat of God's will," he holds, "agree with the Atheist that theism makes a capricious will supreme, and deprive themselves of all answer to the objection that the order and law of nature prove the absence of will." He also maintains, that "philosophy and theology depend on observed facts as really as empirical science; and empirical science depends on rational ideas and principles as really as philosophy and theology." From these statements some idea may be formed of the standpoint from which this volume is written.

Without endorsing all the views advanced in this book, we, nevertheless, heartily commend it to our readers as a truly valuable and elaborate contribution to the philosophical and theological literature of the times. There are few who will not be benefited by the careful study of its pages.

**THE GROUNDS OF THEISTIC AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF.** By George P. Fisher, D.D., LL.D. Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

From the title it might be inferred that this work covers substantially the same ground gone over in the treatise just noticed. Such, however, is not the case. The two works rather supplement each other than treat of the same subject. Even when the topic is the same, the treatment is different, so that the one cannot be said to render the other unnecessary.

The purpose of the present volume is to discuss the evidences of both natural and revealed religion with special reference to the assaults of modern skepticism. In the earlier part of the work, accordingly, the personality of God and man is not only treated of, but also the arguments for the being of God, and the principal anti-theistic theories. In what follows, the possibility and function of miracles with reference to Prof. Huxley's comments on Hume, the proof of miracles, the Gospel history, and arguments in favor of Christianity drawn from various considerations, are discussed. In conclusion attention is directed to Biblical criticism, the canon of the New Testament, and the congruity of the natural and physical sciences with the Christian faith.

The volume throughout is possessed of those excellent characteristics which distinguish the other works of Dr. Fisher and prove him one of the ablest thinkers of our times.

**THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURES.** A Critical, Historical and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. By George T. Ladd, D. D., Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Yale College. Two volumes. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

In these two volumes we have an elaborate and exhaustive inquiry into the origin and nature of the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as considered in the totality of their phenomena and in their complete history. No other work on the subject in the English language, so far as we know, is so complete and satisfactory. Every phase of the question is considered, and the examination takes in the later criticism, as well as the earlier views, as to the sacred canon. Those who would thoroughly acquaint themselves with the origin and nature of the Scriptures will accordingly find these volumes of great service to them.

The treatise is divided into four parts. The first is exegetical and treats of the claims of the Bible. In it there are considered the nature of the Old Testament Scriptures as determined by the teaching of Christ, the claims of the Old Testament in general and of Mosaism in particular, the claims of Prophetism and of the Hohmah, the claims for the Old Testament by the writers of the New, and the claims for the New Testament by its own writers. Prof. Ladd starts out by saying: "The right dogmatic point of view for considering the doctrines of Sacred Scripture must be derived from the doctrine of the person of Christ."

The second part of the work is critical and treats of the phenomena of the Bible. Here we have discussed the so-called scientific, the miraculous, the historical, the predictive, and the ethico-religious contents of the biblical books, and also their authorship, their language and style, and the texts that have come down to us. To those who hold to the traditional view of the origin and nature of the Bible, some of the admissions and statements of Prof. Ladd, in the discussion of these subjects, will prove objectionable, and even startling. The following is the conclusion arrived at at the close of this part of the treatise: "The Bible claims to contain and does contain those sacred and inspired writings which constitute the sources of the history of divine redemption in Christ, and of those ideas and truths of revelation which have been imparted in an historical process to the ever-living Church of God."

The third part is historical and gives an account of the teaching of the Church on the subject. First we have presented the doctrine of Sacred Scripture in the period preceding the Christian era; and then, in order, the doctrine in the ancient Church, the doctrine from 250 A. D. to the Protestant Reformation, from the Reformation to 1750 A. D., and from 1750 A. D.

to the present time. This part of the work we are disposed to think will be found especially interesting and instructive.

The fourth and last part of the treatise is synthetic and treats of the doctrine of the Word of God. The following subjects are fully discussed: the Personality of God, Revelation, the Spirit and the Bible, the subject of Revelation and Inspiration, the Media of Revelation, Inspiration, the Bible and the Word of God, the Bible and the Church, the Authority of the Bible, the Bible as Translated and Interpreted, the Bible as Means of Grace, the Bible and Individual Man, and the Bible and the Race. Prof. Ladd closes his inquiry with the noteworthy statement: "The person of the Redeemer furnishes the interest and point of view for the examination of that book which we call the Bible. The true nature of the book has been revealed only in the light of its relation to the work of redemption. It is the supreme office and crowning glory of the Scriptures to minister to the Holy Spirit in the conforming of the world to the mind and life of Jesus Christ."

The work throughout gives evidence of thorough scholarship and is pervaded by an earnest Christian spirit.

**BIBLICAL STUDY: Its Principles, Methods and History.** Together with a catalogue of Books of Reference. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D. Davenport Professor of Hebrew and the Cognate Languages in the Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

This work is designed to be a guide to Biblical Study for the intelligent layman, as well as the theological student and minister of the Gospel. For this purpose it is admirably adapted in every way. The ground of Biblical Study is substantially covered, the treatment of the various subjects is clear and judicious, and the information given is just such as every intelligent person needs who would understand the discussions which now agitate the religious world as to the Sacred Scriptures, or would enter upon the scientific study of the Scriptures themselves.

The book opens with a chapter on the advantages of Biblical study which, we are assured, is the most important, the most extensive, the most profound and the most attractive of all studies. Then in regular succession are considered exegetical theology, the languages of the Bible, the Bible and criticism, the canon of Scripture, the text of the Bible, the higher criticism, literary study of the Bible, Hebrew poetry, the interpretation of Scripture, and Biblical theology. All these subjects are treated with very marked ability, and in a manner both thorough and satisfactory. On the subject of the Bible and Criticism, Prof Briggs says: "It is significant that the great majority of professional biblical scholars in the various universities and theological halls of the world, embracing those of the greatest learning, industry and piety, demand a revision of traditional theories of the Bible and history. These critics must be met with argument and candid reasoning as to these facts and their interpretation, and cannot be overcome by mere cries of alarm for the Church and the Bible which, in their last analysis, usually amount to

nothing more than peril to certain favorite views." As regards the higher criticism, he says: "We should not allow ourselves to be influenced by the circumstance that the majority of the scholars who have been engaged in these researches have been rationalistic or semi-rationalistic in their religious opinions; and that they have employed the methods and styles peculiar to the German scholarship of our century. Whatever may have been the motives and influences that led to these investigations, the questions we have to determine are: (1) What are the facts of the case? and (2) Do the theories account for the facts?"

The book closes with a chapter on the Scriptures as a means of grace. This is substantially the same as the address delivered by the author in May, 1883, before the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa. To the end of the treatise there is appended a very valuable Catalogue of Books of Reference for biblical study. There are also good indexes of Texts of Scripture, Topics, and Books and Authors.

The book is one that should find a place in the library of every minister, and also in that of every intelligent layman.

A COMPANION TO THE GREEK TESTAMENT AND THE ENGLISH VERSION. By Philip Schaff, D.D., President of the American Committee of Revision. With Fac-simile Illustrations of MSS. and Standard Editions of the New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers; Franklin Square. 1883.

This is a most admirable work, and will be found almost invaluable by those who would thoroughly acquaint themselves with the Greek Testament and the English Version. In a condensed, yet remarkably clear and trustworthy form, there is presented in this volume just such information as every student of the New Testament will find most useful and important to him. No other manual of the kind can be at all compared with it in point of excellence. In its accuracy and in its bibliography it is altogether without a rival. It is, accordingly, a work which no student of the Greek New Testament, whether clergyman or layman, can well afford to be without.

The following are the headings of the different chapters in the book from which some idea may be formed of its Contents: The Language of the New Testament; Manuscripts of the New Testament; Ancient Versions: Patristic Quotations; Textual Criticism; History of the Printed Text; The Authorized Version; The Revised Version. On all these subjects the results of the latest and very best scholarship are given. There are also a number of Appendixes containing much additional matter under the following heads; List of Printed Editions of the Greek New Testament; Fac-similes of Standard Editions of the Greek Testament; List of English and American Revisers; List of American Changes Adopted by the English Committee; and Adoption of the Revision by the Baptists. Besides a table of Contents, the book also contains an Alphabetical Index and an Index of Scripture Passages Explained.

The thanks of all who are interested in Biblical Study are due to Dr. Schaff for preparing a manual of so great excellence, and to Messrs. Harper and Brothers for publishing it in such a convenient and substantial form.

**BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** By Dr. Bernhard Weiss, Counsellor of the Consistory and Professor of Theology in Berlin. Translated from the Third Revised Edition by Rev. David Eaton, M.A., Dufftown. Two Volumes. Edinburg: T. & T. Clark. 1882.

The third revised German edition of this work from which the present translation has been made, was published in 1879. In it, accordingly, we have the latest results of the investigations of its learned author in this department of theology. It may not be out of place here to state, that Biblical Theology is to be distinguished from Biblical Dogmatics. "As the former," says Dr. Weiss in the Introduction to his work, "is a historical, the latter is a systematic science; as the former has to do with the variety of biblical forms of teaching, the latter has to do with the unity of the truth which is recorded in these." He also further informs us, that "since biblical theology has to represent the manifoldness of the forms of teaching it falls into a series of doctrinal systems." Hence the present work is divided into five parts.

In the first part the teaching of Jesus according to the earliest tradition is considered. This tradition our author finds in the three Synoptic Gospels. The second part treats of the original Apostolic type of doctrine previous to the time of Paul, as contained in the discourses of the Acts of the Apostles, the First Epistle of Peter and the Epistle of James. Paulinism is the subject of the third part. In it we have presented the earliest preaching of Paul as an Apostle to the Gentiles, the doctrinal system of the four great doctrinal and controversial Epistles, the development of Paulinism in the Epistles of the imprisonment, and the doctrinal method of the pastoral Epistles. The fourth part treats of the Early-Apostolic doctrinal system in the post-Pauline period. This system according to our Author is contained in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, the Johannean Apocalypse, and the historical books. In the fifth and last part the Johannean theology is considered. This is gathered from the Gospel of John and the three Epistles of John. In the treatment of all these various subjects the great ability and learning of the author are everywhere apparent.

The work is one of the most important contributions to the theological science of our times, and will be found a serviceable guide through the rich world of Scripture truth in its manifold forms.

**THE SCRIPTURAL IDEA OF MAN.** Six Lectures Given before the Theological Students at Princeton on the L. P. Stone Foundation. By Mark Hopkins, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1883.

In these lectures Dr. Hopkins discusses the origin and nature of man as taught in the Sacred Scriptures. He does this with special reference to prevailing theories, so that this little volume may be truly called a book for the times. In the opening lecture the doctrine that man was created by God is

ably defended and some difficult questions presented for the consideration of evolutionists. The second and third lectures treat of man as created in the image of God. This, Dr. Hopkins maintains, must consist in the essential difference or differences between man and the creatures below him. "These differences," he says, "are found mainly, first, in the intellect of man regarded as rational; second, in his moral and spiritual nature; and third, in his freedom, including the great fact that man is, and the brute is not, a proper and responsible cause. God is a proper cause, and if man were not, he could not be in His image. So long, therefore, as man continues to be rational, moral, and free, and hence capable of knowing God, he will be in His image; and when he ceases to be rational, moral and free, he will be no longer man." The nature of knowledge, feeling, freedom, and causative power are ably discussed in these two lectures. In the fourth lecture the moral nature is considered, and in the fifth, man as having dominion, and as male and female. What is said on the latter subject is especially worthy of attention. In the closing lecture man in his present state is considered, and also "the man Christ Jesus" in whom alone all the capabilities of man and his possible relations as the Scriptures represent them can be known by us.

These lectures are fresh, able and learned, and will repay careful study.

**FRENCH CELEBRITIES.** By Ernest Daudet and others. Translated by Frances W. Potter. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street.

This work contains brief biographies of Marshal De MacMahon, Leon Gambetta, Jules Grévy, Louis Blanc, Charles De Freycinet, Victor Hugo, and Ferdinand De Lesseps. These are names that constantly recur in reading current French history, and it is a great satisfaction to know something about them. For that purpose a brief outline, such as is here given, is all that the reader needs.

**FRENCH CELEBRITIES. PART SECOND.** By Jules Claritie and others. New York: Funk & Wagnalls. 10 and 12 Dey Street.

Brief biographies of the following celebrities are given in this volume: Jules Ferry, George Clémenceau, Ernest Renan, Henri Rocheford, Challe-mel-Lacour, Jules Simon, Erkmann-Chatrian, Paul Bert, and Alphonse Daudet.

**THE INNER LIFE OF CHRIST,** as revealed in the Gospel of Matthew. By Joseph Parker, D.D., vol. II. "Servant of all." New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street. 1883.

We regret that (possibly by some mistake of the publishers) we have not before us the 1st vol. of this work. But our examination of the 2d vol. enables us to commend the work as containing much interesting and instructive reading. It is more than a commentary. It contains eloquent discourses on the passages commented upon. We should say it is very profitable for ministers, because it contains a practical application of Scripture by one of the first preachers of the day. No one will tire in reading it, for it is all



alive with thought and scholarship, and the style is fresh and incisive. We do not know that we would recommend the style as a model for others, but it serves its purpose in keeping up interest and holding the attention of the reader.

**BY-WAYS OF LITERATURE.** By D. H. Wheeler, New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street.

We have read this work with interest. The titles of the chapters will convey in brief space what it contains: 1. A Fourteenth Century Book for Women; 2. English Girls in the Old Times; 3. English Boys in the Old Times; 4. Old Education and Modern; 5. The Robin Hood Ballads; 6. The Legends of King Arthur; 7. The Founders' Age in our Literature; 8. Shakespeare on Greatness; 9. Englishmen, their Language and Countries; 10. A Grammatical Revolution; 11. Our Spoken English.

For young readers especially this work contains a great deal of valuable information on the beginnings of English literature, and it will serve a good purpose in sharpening the appetite for reading the English Classics.

**THE LIFE OF MARTIN LUTHER.** By Dr. William Rein. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 10 and 12 Dey Street.

This is a translation by Rev. G. F. Behringer, of Brooklyn, N. Y. It was prepared as a contribution to the celebration of the 400th Anniversary of Luther's birth. A careful reading of it will supply not only a knowledge of the life of Luther, but also of the opening and progress of the Reformation in Germany. The chapter on the *Conference* at Marburg does not present Luther in a very good attitude. Though accustomed to get off jokes at the expense of others, he bristled up and became angry when Zwingli sportively remarked, quoting a passage from the 6th chap. of St. John, "This passage will break your neck, Doctor." Luther's reply, "Do not exalt yourself too highly; you are in Hesse and not in Switzerland," &c., reveals the prejudice in Luther's mind against the Swiss. It was this dislike of the Swiss on the part of the Germans, as much perhaps as the difference in doctrine, that led to Luther's refusal even to shake hands with Zwingli. As the celebration of the 400th anniversary of Zwingli's birth is about to be observed in the Reformed Church, the lives of both Zwingli and Luther should be read and studied anew.

**GEMS OF ILLUSTRATION** from the Sermons and other writings of the Rev. Thomas Guthrie, D.D. Arranged under the Subjects which they Illustrate. By an American Clergyman. Second Edition. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street.

Books of sermons generally are not considered very interesting reading, just because sermons are designed to be *heard*, not read. But there are exceptions to this. There are preachers whose sermons are models of style as well as reservoirs of thought. By means of them one can learn lessons in Exegesis and especially Hermeneutics better, in some respects, than from

books directly on those subjects. The power of some sermons consists almost entirely upon the manner of their delivery: again there are other sermons that contain great force for reading.

The London *Times*, in 1860, said: "Dr. Guthrie is the most eloquent orator in Europe." The celebrated Dr. Candlish, in an address to the General Assembly of the Free Church of Scotland, in May, 1862, said: "Dr. Guthrie's genius has long since placed him at the head of all the gifted and popular preachers of our day." Similar testimony was given by the late Dr. James W. Alexander.

This book gives us just what is most delightful in Dr. Guthrie's sermons, his *Gems of Illustration*. For the general reader the whole sermons would be more instructive, but not so fascinating as these selections. For ministers, we should say, these gems are much more desirable than the sermons entire would be. In all sermons, even the very best, there is much matter which a cultivated mind can supply for itself. This is the case especially with ministers. We once heard the remark of an intelligent layman, a celebrated lawyer, that in listening to ordinary preachers he attended to the text and got the outline of the sermon, and then went off in his thought upon other subjects until the sermon was ended; he could supply himself pretty much all that would be said. We give this, not as an example to be followed, but merely as an illustration of what we have said, viz., that in sermons generally there is much that a cultivated mind can supply for itself. But *Gems of Illustration* cannot be thus easily supplied. They are the rarest flowers, culled by the most skillful hand. Moreover they are often just what the preacher most needs.

Here these gems are, gathered with a great deal of labor, and alphabetically arranged, so that they can be easily referred to. Activity—Christian, 8 specimens; Afflictions, 10 examples; Ambition, 1; Atheism, 4; Beauty, 3; Benevolence, 2; Bible, 7; and so on to the end of the alphabet. Then follows a copious index of 9 double column pages.

It behooves that such a book should be published in good style, and such is the case with this solid, handsome volume. It is a real pleasure to handle it as it is pleasant and profitable to read it. Of course it is like a dictionary, the subject changes very frequently, but is more for reference than consecutive reading. We believe an examination of it will sustain all we have now said of it. *Verb. sap. sat.*

**TRAPS FOR THE YOUNG.** By Anthony Comstock. New York; Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street, 1883.

A book of 250 pages, handsomely bound and filled with startling and important information, which it is well for parents to read. The evils that beset the young are not confined to the city, but extend also by means of the press to all sections of the country. Mr. Comstock has doubtless done a good work, though a thankless one, and one that few would care to undertake.

Some must do the sort of work he has done, and he seems to have a calling for it. Of course it is of a negative character only, removing, or trying to remove, the outward temptations to sin—the traps that ensnare the young. The other and positive work must ever be done in the virtuous household, where children breathe the atmosphere of moral purity, in Christian training. Still it is well for unsuspecting parents to read a book like this, even those in the quiet country, in order to learn how the tempter may insinuate himself into their households by means of the press.

We do not indeed share in the feeling of panic which some of these external and negative efforts sometimes create, the feeling and fear that a volcano is about to blow up all the foundations of society. There is a power within in good Christian nurture, in virtuous homes and virtuous society, that is stronger than all manner of diabolism. Upon that chiefly we must build. Before it external temptations become disarmed of their power. It may as a rule be best also not to agitate, at least not overmuch, the external workings and machinations of the evil one, as St. Paul directs in regard to a certain vice, "let them not so much as be named among you." Still we believe the reading of this book will do much good. The publishers have done their part well. It contains an introduction by J. M. Buckley, D.D.

**ILLUSTRATIONS AND MEDITATIONS ; or Flowers from a Puritan's Garden, Distilled and Dispensed.** By C. H. Spurgeon. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 12 Dey Street.

This is a quaint and interesting volume. It is made up, as indicated on the title-page, of Illustrations, and of Meditations on the same. The illustrations are taken from the works of Rev. Thomas Manton, a staunch Puritan of the seventeenth century, who was one of Cromwell's chaplains and made the prayer at Cromwell's installation, June 26, 1657. Of the sermons of Manton, Mr. Spurgeon says in the preface to the present work: "For solid, sensible instruction forcibly delivered, they cannot be surpassed." He also says: "Ministers who do not know Manton need not wonder if they are themselves unknown." This high estimate of the worth of Manton's writings is sustained by the illustrations contained in the volume before us. They are without exception among the best we have met with anywhere. In a few words often, we have, as it were, a whole sermon condensed. The meditations on these illustrations are by Mr. Spurgeon. They possess all the excellent characteristics of his other writings, and cannot be studied without profit. We would therefore recommend this work to all our readers. They will find it an admirable volume to have on the study table or in some convenient place to take up during odd moments. Both the illustrations and the meditations are brief, and relate to almost every subject pertaining to the Christian life.

**THE PRIEST AND THE MAN ; or Abelard and Heloisa.** An Historical Romance. By William Wilberforce Newton. Boston: Cupples, Upham & Co., 1883.

In this volume the pathetic story of Peter Abelard and Heloisa Fulbert is

presented in an unusually interesting and instructive manner. Though the work is professedly a romance, yet so strictly in accordance with the facts in the case is the story told, that it might almost be accepted as a history. To the ordinary reader we have reason to believe it will give even a truer insight into the character of the hero and of the heroine, as well as of the relations existing between them and of the times in which they lived, than he would be likely to derive from the usual historical sources. The author evidently before writing the story took pains thoroughly to inform himself with regard to the life, character and works of Abelard, as well as with the customs and opinions of the age to which he belonged. We would therefore commend the work to those who would acquaint themselves with the character of Abelard and the tragic story of his love. In an Appendix to the work are given the Letters of Abelard and Heloisa as translated from the Latin by Joseph Berington.

CONSTANTINOPLE. By Edmondo De Amicis. Translated from the seventh Italian edition, by Caroline Tilton. Fourth edition. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 27 and 29 West 23d Street. 1882.

Though this book has not come into our hands directly from the Publishers with a request for notice, and though it has not the advantage of being just issued from the press, yet we deem it eminently worthy of being brought to the attention of our readers. It has won the approval and admiration of a very intelligent reading club, whose judgment we can add to our own, as to its interest and worth. It is one of the best books of travel that has fallen into our hands, and gives one of the best descriptions of one of the historic cities of the world that we have ever read. We can safely recommend it as a work of interesting and profitable reading, and one over which the reader never tires, because the style is of the most lively and graphic character.

FROM GLOOM TO GLADNESS: Illustrations of Life from the Biography of Esther. By Rev. Joseph S. Vandyke, A. M. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 10 and 13 Dey Street.

A handsome little volume of 269 pages, suitable for Sunday-school or congregational libraries, and for all who feel interested in the understanding of this rather curious book in the sacred canon. We believe it is the only book in the Bible in which the name of God does not occur. Yet it forms a unique and charming chapter in the strange and eventful history of the elect nation. "There is no life," says Carlyle, "but is a heroic poem of its sort." "Certainly, of the lives so faithfully recorded in Scripture, all are worthy of study, truths for the active present being mirrored from the silent past." Perhaps the reading of this volume may induce many to read this book in the sacred record who have never read it before; and certainly all Scripture is given for our profit.